

**This is an authorized facsimile
and was produced by microfilm-xerography
in 1981 by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
London, England**

8008701

BEDROSIAN, ROBERT GREGORY

THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE LORDS OF ARMENIA IN THE 13-14TH
CENTURIES

Columbia University

PH.D.

1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

Copyright 1979

by

BEDROSIAN, ROBERT GREGORY

All Rights Reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

**THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE LORDS
OF ARMENIA IN THE 13-14TH CENTURIES**

Robert Gregory Bedrosian

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Philosophy
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
1979**

ABSTRACT

THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE LORDS OF ARMENIA IN THE 13-14TH CENTURIES

ROBERT GREGORY BEDROSIAN

The 13-14th centuries was a period of great turbulence in the history of the Armenian people. Over roughly 170 years (from ca. 1220 to ca. 1403) Armenia was subjected to no less than 15 invasions of Turco--Mongol peoples. The Armenian societies conquered and controlled by the various nomadic invaders from Central Asia had already experienced conquest and domination by nomadic and sedentarizing Turkic peoples two centuries earlier. The experience of invasion by nomads from Central Asia consequently, was not new to the Armenian historical experience. But there were differences among the invading groups, and differences within any one invading group.

Just as there were differences among and even within the different invading groups, so the sedentary Armenian societies which came to be dominated were of different sorts. Subject to different political entities, the various districts of "Armenia" in the 13-14th centuries were (and had been, historically) subjected to different

ethnic, economic, and cultural stimuli. The Armenian or part-Armenian populations of these states subscribed to a variety of religions ranging from Apostolic, Orthodox, and Roman Catholic Christianity, to Islam. Even north-eastern Armenian society (for which the historical record is the most complete) on the eve of the Turco-Mongol invasions was far from being a homogeneous ethnic, cultural or religious entity. Even where Armenians were in political control of Armenian-inhabited territories, a geographically--derived centrifugalism made the lords (naxarars) of the various districts disinclined to unite. In the 13-14th centuries, therefore, Armenia experienced the effects of a double centrifugation: of Turco-Mongol societies in dissolution, and of native Armenian naxarar society, which was itself characterized by centrifugation.

This study has two principal aims. A review of the salient political and military events associated with the Turco-Mongol invasions of Armenia is one aim. Who were the invaders, and in what ways were they alike and dissimilar? The second aim of the study is an examination of the impact(s) of the invasions and domination(s) of the 13-14th centuries on Armenia's lordly naxarar rulers. While many aspects of both areas of investigation (i.e., regarding the invasions and dominations and their impacts) have already been examined by scholars, to the present no single study has focussed on the invasions of Armenia as phenomena. Similarly, while diverse aspects of Armenia's

socio-economic and political history in the 13-14th centuries have been examined by others, no single study of the lordly heads of that society has as yet been undertaken. The present work, therefore, attempts to fill a void existing in Armenian scholarship. It is hoped that this study will likewise serve as an introduction to 13-14th century Armenian history for Western scholars, to whom Armenia in this period has remained terra incognita.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| <u>Introduction .</u> | 1 |
| I. <u>The Sources.</u> | 10 |
| II. <u>Armenia and the Turco-Mongol Invasions.</u> | 63 |
| III. <u>Armenia's Lords and Their Reactions to the Turco-Mongol Invasions and Domination of the 13-14th Centuries.</u> | 156 |
| Appendix A. <u>Supplementary Notes on the 11-13th Century <u>Naxarars.</u></u> | 249 |
| Appendix B. <u>Aspects of Centrifugalism within and among Certain 13-14th Century <u>Naxarardoms.</u></u> | 266 |
| Appendix C. <u>Notes on the Relations between the Mongols and the Armenian Church in the 13th Century.</u> | 281 |
| <u>Bibliography.</u> | 293 |
| <u>Glossary.</u> | 311 |

INTRODUCTION

The history of Greater Armenia in the 13-14th centuries is not well known to Western scholars. To Armenists, however, with the possible exception of Armenia's "golden age" (5th century A.D.), no period has received as much attention as the 13-14th centuries. The nature and diversity of the primary sources as well as the uses to which they have been put provide explanations for both opposing tendencies. Western scholars have been most interested in the Armenian sources for what they tell about the Mongols. Such interest explains the translated anthologies of relevant sections of the Armenian sources¹ which focus on the Mongols in Armenia or the Mongols in the Armenian sources, but not on Armenia or the Armenians per se. Despite the existence of such anthologies and of full translations of the Armenian sources (in some cases for over 100 years),

1

For example, K. Patkanov's two-volume Russian anthology which appeared in St. Petersburg in 1873 and 1874, Istoriia mongolov po armianskim istochnikam [History of the Mongols According to the Armenian Sources] which includes extracts from Vardan, Orbelean, Smbat Sparapet, and Kirakos Ganjakec'i; A.G. Galstyan's Armianskie istochniki o mongolakh [Armenian Sources on the Mongols] (Moscow, 1962); and the translations into English of various passages from Kirakos Ganjakec'i dealing with the Mongols made by J.A. Boyle. Bibliographical indications, when not provided in the text will be found in the Bibliography.

these sources remain under-utilized in some modern studies of the Mongols¹.

In recent times, works devoted to the history of Asia Minor in the 11-15th centuries have made use of some 13-14th century Armenian sources in translation. C. Cahen's Pre-Ottoman Turkey (New York, 1968) cites several Armenian sources, "those from Cilicia and those from Āzarbāījān" (sic)². His study concentrates on the history of the Turks of western and central Asia Minor. When speaking about the Armenians of eastern Asia Minor, however, Cahen sometimes makes egregious errors³.

S. Vryonis' Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century (Los Angeles, 1971) utilizes translated Armenian sources more fully than Cahen's work, but as Cahen, Vryonis is not primarily interested in the Armenians of eastern Asia Minor. His work focusses on the Greek element in western and central Asia Minor, mentioning the Armenians only occasionally and peripherally.

1 Most surprisingly in B. Spuler's History of the Mongols Based on Eastern and Western Accounts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (Berkeley, 1972) which does not include a single Armenian or Georgian source. J. A. Boyle's scholarly studies are a welcome exception.

2 PT p. 438.

3 PT pp. 204, 326

If the history of 13-14th century Armenia is not well known in the West, the opposite situation prevails among Armenists. Far from being under-studied, the 13-14th centuries have attracted considerable interest. The abundance of source material explains this in part. Armenists have been interested primarily in various aspects of the socio-economic and political life of Armenia during a period when the Mongols figured as conquerors and overlords, but not as creators of that distinctive culture. The first Armenist to deal with the 13-14th centuries was the Mxit'arist father M. ĆamĆean, in the third volume of his History of Armenia (Venice, 1786). ĆamĆean's account, in addition to being clerical and patriotic is also episodic. When faced with insufficient sources for late 13th century Greater Armenia (no published corpora of colophons or inscriptions existed in his day) ĆamĆean moved his focus to Cilician Armenia. The history of Greater Armenia in the 14th century is entirely omitted.

Scholarly activity on the period of interest done during the 19th century may be divided into two main categories. First, the 19th century saw the beginning of the publication of the classical Armenian texts and their translations into European languages, especially into Russian and French. In the absence of critical editions--which have begun to appear only recently-- the

19th century publications are still the ones utilized today. The scholarly notes of the editors and translators of these texts constituted a step forward in the study of the 13-14th centuries. The second category of activity began in the mid-19th century and built into an ever stronger wave of publications devoted to diverse aspects of the period. Such were the numerous historico--geographical studies of authors including S. Jalaleanc', E. Lalayean, M. Barxudareanc' and L. Ališan. In the early 20th century these scholars were joined by many others who turned their attention to the history of one particular feudal family, one city, or monastic complex. Among these were I.A. Orbeli, G. Yovsep'ean, A. Šahnazarean, and L. Movsesēan. The general lines of such research were continued and amplified in the 1920-1950's by many scholars working in Europe and in the newly-created Soviet republic of Armenia¹.

1

Foremost among the European Armenists were fathers Nerses Akinean and H. Oskean. Among the numerous Soviet scholars deserving attention belong N. Marr, H. Manandyan, M. Abeġyan, T'. Avdalbekyan, X. Samuelyan, S. Eremyan, L. Melik'set'-bek, K. ġafadaryan, A. Hovannisyan, H. Zamkoġyan, L. Xaġikyan, A. Galstyan, and P. Muradyan. For their contributions see below chapter one (Sources) under Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Vardan Arewelc'i, Step'annos Orbelean, Grigor Aknerc'i, T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, Chronographies and Hagiographical Literature, Colophons, and Inscriptions. See Bibliography for full listing.

In recent times a number of Armenian studies dealing with the 13-14th centuries have appeared. These are H. Manandyan's Critical Survey of the History of the Armenian People, vol. 3 (Erevan, 1952), L.H. Babayan's Socio-Economic and Political History of Armenia in the XIII-XIV Centuries [SEPHA], (Erevan, 1964; Moscow, 1969), and the same author's chapters in vol. 3 of the series History of the Armenian People [HAP], (Erevan, 1976) wherein Babayan revised some of the views expressed in his earlier studies. Manandyan's and Babayan's works concern the socio-economic and political history of Armenia during the 11-14th centuries (Manandyan), 13-14th centuries (Babayan, SEPHA), and the mid-9th--mid-14th centuries (Babayan, HAP) i.e., these studies embrace the Turco-Mongol invasions but do not feature them as the central or sole objects of study. Not only is the focus never on the invasions themselves as phenomena, but there is even some disagreement on periodizing the invasions. Manandyan, both in the chronological limits given to his work and in a chapter in his Trade and Cities of Armenia in Connection with Ancient World Trade (Lisbon, 1965) showed an awareness that Turco-Tatar included the 11th century Saljuqs as well as 13-14th century Mongols, but he nowhere compared and contrasted the invasions. Babayan's work on Armenia in the 13-14th centuries does not treat the Saljuq invasions, nor are the Saljuqs mentioned in his article, "Consequences of the Dominance of the Nomadic Feudal

Economic System on the Economic Life of Sedentary Peoples". Furthermore, vol. 3 of the History of the Armenian People ("Armenia in the Period of Developed Feudalism") does not accept the invasions of Tīmūr in the early 15th century as a terminus, since the volume ends in the mid-14th century. Thus, between Manandyan and Babayan there is no study of the 11-14th century Turco-Mongol invasions as invasions, or even agreement on periodizing the invasions.

The present study has two principal aims. First, the political-military history of the Turco-Mongol invasions from the 11th century to the early years of the 15th century is provided. The invasions, their participants and their consequences are compared and contrasted. Such a review fills a gap both in Western and in Armenian scholarship. The writing of this part of the study was facilitated by the works of Cahen and Vryonis, Manandyan, Babayan, Yuzbašyan and many others--Western and Eastern scholars not well acquainted with each other's work. Because of the complexity of the period and the unfamiliarity of the material to the general reader, background information on Armenia in the pre-Saljuq period (especially the political-ethnic conditions on Armenia's elusive borders) is provided in the notes to chapter two ("Armenia and the Turco-Mongol Invasions"). The notes for much of the second part of the chapter contain, in addition to documentation, extensive translations from the relevant Armenian sources

themselves. In this case, as in chapter one, it was deemed advisable to place special emphasis on the Armenian sources, which are simultaneously the least known and the most important for this study¹.

The second aim of the study is to examine topically several aspects of the impact of the 13-14th century invasions on the Armenian lords of Greater Armenia. By way of introduction, chapter three begins with a discussion of who the lords (naxarars) were on the eve of the 13th century (during the so-called Zak'arid revival), and where their lands were located. The remainder of the chapter examines three questions: (1) how did the naxarars react to the Turco-Mongol invasions/migrations of the 13th century; (2) how did the Mongols (both before and after Islamization) attempt to control the naxarars, and finally, (3) what were the reactions of the naxarars to Mongol policies. The writing of this part of the study was facilitated first by the studies of Adontz, Manandyan, and Toumanoff, devoted to Armenia's social structure in earlier times (5-9th centuries). The many studies of Afak'elyan,

1

As a result, the information in chapter one on the Armenian sources serves as a preface to the translated portions of the sources appearing in chapters two and three which form an anthology of 13-14th century Armenian historical writings focussing on the Turco-Mongol invasions and domination(s) and the Armenian lords' reactions to them. It should be noted that while both Manandyan and Babayan conducted surveys of the Armenian sources, their reviews tend to be catalogues with little indication of a source's specific relevance. M. Abekyan's History of Ancient Armenia. Literature vol. 2 (Erevan, 1946) examined the literary (and often historical) importance of the 13-14th century sources. Thus

Babayan, Manandyan and Muşelyan, devoted to the 13-14th centuries were also very useful for questions pertaining to economic history. It should be stressed that this is not a study of 13-14th century Armenian society in its entirety, but rather of the lordly heads of that society in Greater Armenia. For questions concerning Armenia's peasants, and the complicated history of the Armenian Church in this period, the works of Manandyan, Babayan and Ormanian should be consulted.

The second part of the study, while drawing on the works of the above-mentioned scholars, is more than a synthesis. This is the first study of the 13-14th century lords which draws heavily on information found in the Georgian History of K'art'li. During the 13-14th centuries when Armenia was politically part of a Georgian state, many of its lords held important positions in the Georgian court (see chapter two and Appendix A for background). Much invaluable information on the lords is found in the History of K'art'li. Despite this, both Manandyan and (more surprisingly) Babayan relied on a brief Armenian abridgement of the History made by Melik'set'-bek which limits itself solely to "Armenia".

the survey of 13-14th century literary historians in chapter one below is the most extensive currently available.

This study, therefore, provides information unavailable elsewhere not only on the 13-14th century invasions, but also on their socio-political impact on Armenia's naxarars. Appendices B and C contain supplementary information on topics not examined by others, e.g., on the centrifugal forces operating within Armenian society, and on certain relations between the Mongols and the Armenian Church.

The transliteration systems followed here are the prevailing Hübschmann-Meillet system for Armenian, an adaptation of it for Georgian, and the system employed in volume 5 of the Cambridge History of Iran (the Saljuq and Mongol Periods) for Turkish and Mongolian. Double forms are utilized for localities which are identified in the sources by more than one name (e.g., Karin/Erzerum, Sebastia/Sīvās). Finally, to eliminate unnecessary confusion, and since this study focusses on Armenia, Georgian forms of proper names have been given in their Armenian equivalents (e.g., Šahnšah, not Šahnše; Zak'arē, not Zak'aria).

CHAPTER ONE
THE SOURCES

There are several ways of categorizing and characterizing the 13-14th century sources bearing on the two aspects of this study, i.e. on (1) the Turco-Mongol invasions of Armenia, and (2) the history of the Armenian lords in the 13-14th centuries. Some of the sources, such as the Armenian and Georgian literary histories, treat both topics and consequently are of principal importance. These include the histories of 13-14th century clerical authors from the Caucasus: Kirakos of Ganjak and Vardan the Easterner (Arewelc'i), both of whom died ca. 1270/71, Step'annos Orbēlean (d. 1304), the Georgian History of K'art'li (1330?), and T'ovma Mecop'ec'i (d. 1446). The History of the Nation of the Archers by a Cilician cleric, Grigor Aknerc'i (d. 1335?) though geographically removed from Greater Armenia, nonetheless contains material about Greater Armenia not found in the local sources themselves regarding both the invasions and the lords. Armenian chronographies, colophons and hagiographical literature likewise supply information both regarding the invasions and the lords. Frequently their authors concentrated on their own immediate milieus thereby providing important information on local events. Sometimes written by clerics possessing limited educations, they are narrower in scope and more mundane than the literary histories,

but precisely that narrow scope and those mundane interests are what make such sources valuable. The early 13th century was a period of vigorous building activity across the Armenian highlands, and it was customary for the lordly patrons of this activity to inscribe the walls of their edifices with sometimes lengthy inscriptions. Besides containing much of interest for economic history, the inscriptions often contain lordly titles and valuable geneological information. The 13-14th century Armenian sources are not well known to Western scholars, and consequently, are under-utilized in their studies. For this reason, and because the sources are scattered, a more detailed investigation of these sources and their authors appears justified (see below). Conversely, sources familiar to scholars-- Juvainī, Rashīd al-Dīn, etc.--are but briefly examined for their relevance to the two specific areas of interest to this study. These latter will be addressed first.

Persian literary histories of the 13-14th centuries tend to be of importance more for the study of the invasions and their economic impact on the Armenian highlands, than for the history of the lords. The histories of Juvainī (d.1283)¹

¹ 'Ala ad-Dīn 'Ata-Malik Juvainī (ca. 1226-83) was in an excellent position to obtain information about various parts of the Mongol empire and particularly about the Caucasus. His great-grandfather had been an advisor to the Khwarazm Shāh Tekish, and other relatives had served the Saljuqs in Iran [Juvaini, The History of the World-Conqueror, J.A. Boyle, trans., vol. I (Manchester, 1958) p. xv]. His grandfather was the

and Rashīd al-Dīn (d. 1317)¹, for example, are more directly concerned with the Mongols than with the Armenian

sāhib-dīvān or Minister of Finance for the Khwarāzmi Shāhs Muhammad and Jalāl al-Dīn, and had died during the latter's siege of Xlat' on the northern shore of Lake Van (ibid. p. xvi). Juvaini's own father, Baha ad-Dīn, became the Minister of Finance for Chingiz-Khan's successor, Ögedei, and during the absence of his immediate superior, the emir Arghun (ca. 1246), Baha ad-Dīn acted as Arghun's deputy over a large area including Georgia and Armenia (ibid. p. xviii). Juvaini himself became an important official of the empire. Twice during his youth he had visited the Mongol capital of Qara-Qorum, commencing his history of the Mongols conquests on one such visit (ca. 1252-53) (ibid. pp. xviii-xx). He had been with the Il-Khan Hülegü in 1256 at the taking of the Assassins' stronghold Alamut, and was responsible for saving part of its celebrated library (ibid. p. xxi). He had accompanied Hülegü during the sack of Baghdad (1258), and the next year was appointed governor of Baghdad, Lower Mesopotamia, and Khuzistan by him (ibid. p. xxii). Around 1282, Juvaini attended a Mongol quriltai (or assembly) held in the Ala-Taq pastures, northeast of Lake Van (ibid. p. xxiv). He died the following year in Mughan or Arran in Azarbaijan (ibid. p. xxv). Juvaini's influential brother Shams ad-Dīn, who had served as Minister of Finance under Khans Hülegü and Abaqa, was the husband of Košak', daughter of Awak Zak'arean/Mxargrceli (ibid. p. xvi; KC, p. 251). Consequently, both through his own work and through family connections, Juvaini was privy to information unavailable to other historians. For some unknown reason Juvaini's history terminates more than twenty years before the author's death, with the year 1260.

1

Rashīd al-Dīn (b. 1247 in Hamadan) was a Jewish convert to Islam who served as physician to the Il-Khan Abaqa (1265-81), possibly the steward to the Il-Khan Geikhatu (1291-95), and as financial advisor to Abaqa's grandson, Ghazan (1295-1304) [Rashid al-Dīn, The Successors of Genghis Khan, J.A. Boyle, trans. (New York, 1971) pp. 3-4]. He was commissioned by the latter to write a history of the Mongols and their conquests, which he completed during the reign of Oljeitü (1307-16). This work, the Complete Collection of Histories (Jami' al-Tawarikh) was at the time of completion (ca. 1307) of monumental size. Unfortunately all sections have not survived or been discovered (ibid. pp. 6-13; also A.Z.V. Togan, "Still Missing Works of Rashid al-Dīn", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964) pp. 113-22). Two portions

nobility. Nonetheless, their works show Armenia as part of the larger picture of the Mongol conquests and of the Il-Khānid empire as a whole. Both authors were officials of the Mongol government in Iran, both were Muslims, and had sensibilities other than those found reflected in the Christian Caucasāian sources. For example, the Khwarāzm Shāh Jalāl al-Dīn's activities in Armenia which included demolishing churches and executing Christians are described approvingly by Juvainī. A Muslim viewpoint also characterizes

of the surviving encyclopedia, volumes II and III, are of great importance for the study of the Il-Khanate. Volume II is an account of the successors of Chingiz-Khān while volume III describes the Il-Khans of Iran. In his narration down to the reign of Mōngke (1251-59), Juvainī was Rashid al-Dīn's main source, however, he also utilized numerous now-lost Far Eastern and other sources. The Jami' al-Tawarikh is perhaps the single most comprehensive Persian source on the Mongol period. [J.A. Boyle, "Juvainī and Rashid al-Dīn as Sources on the History of the Mongols", in Historians of the Middle East, B. Lewis, ed. (New York, 1962) pp. 133-37. In an article entitled "The Collection of Annals of Rashid-ad-Din and Its Armenian Sources [Rashid-ad-Dini Taregrut yunneri Zolovacun ev nra haykakan abvurnere]", PBH #2 (1965) pp. 81-94] L.H. Babayan attempted (unsuccessfully) to prove that Rashid had utilized Armenian sources in Persian translation. He offered no convincing proof of the assertion. Such an important official as Rashid was in an excellent position to utilize diverse sources of information on Armenia, especially archival material. He himself owned large estates in the Caucasus and Asia Minor. Finally, as Boyle writes: "The administration of the state [during Oljeitū's reign] had become almost a private monopoly of his family: of his fourteen sons, eight were governors of provinces, including the whole of western Iran, Georgia, Iraq, and the greater part of what is now Turkey" (Successors, p. 4). As a result of the successful intrigues of jealous courtiers, Rashid al-Dīn was brutally executed in 1317. Volume II of his History dealing with Chingiz' successors down to Ghazan has been translated in part by J.A. Boyle. Volume III was translated into Russian by A.K. Arends and issued in 1946, Rashid-ad-Din, Sbornik letopisei, t. III, (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946). For other translations, full or partial see the bibliography in Boyle's Successors, pp. 333-38.

Ibn Bibi's History of the Saljuqs, written in the latter part of the 13th century in Persian. This work, written at the request of the Persian historian Juvainī is a panegyric to the Saljuq sultan Kai-Qubād I (1220-37). Nonetheless, it does provide some information on military and political events in western historical Armenia which was under Saljuq control in the 13th century, mentions the presence of Armenians in the Saljuq army and court, conversions to Islam, and the presence of Turkmen settlements¹.

Other sources--works of a chronographical nature--also provide information more important for military, political and economic history than for study of the Armenian lords. Among these sources are the works of Ibn al-Athīr (d. 1234), Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286) and Abu'l Fida (d. 1333). While Ibn

1

The History of the Saljuqs by Ibn Bibi, a Persian living in Rum embraces the period 1192-1282 and describes major events in Asia Minor and Cilicia. Almost nothing is known about the author, albeit judging from the fact that his father had been a secretary at the court of the Khwārazm Shah Jalal al-Dīn, and his mother a noted astronomer, Ibn Bibi probably received a fine education. After the defeat of Jalal al-Dīn by the Mongols in 1231, his family sought refuge with Melik Ashraf in Damascus. At the invitation of the sultan of Rum, 'Ala' al-Dīn, the family moved to Konya where they settled. He gives most of his attention to the deeds of 'Ala' al-Dīn Kai-Qubad I, which are described in a florid oriental style and are heavily influenced by the legendary exploits of heroes in the Shahname. A later unknown individual made a summary of the History in which he attempted to eliminate the wearisome mythological allusions. The French translation of this abridged version was published by Houtsma in 1902 [Histoire des Seldjoucides d'Asie Mineure d'après l'Abregé du Seldjouknameh d'Ibn Bibi, (Paris, 1902)], and a German translation of the critical edition of the same abridged text was issued by Herbert Duda in 1959 [Die Seltshukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi Munks-aard (Kopenhagen, 1959)]. Those portions of the History

al-Athīr had little to say about Armenia's lords, his information on the resurgence of Georgia and the coming of the Mongols, Qipchaqs and Khwārazmians in the early 1220's confirms and occasionally amplifies what is known from native sources¹. For the purposes of this study, the most important of the numerous works bequeathed to posterity by Bar Hebraeus is his encyclopedic Chronography, a history of the world from Creation until 1286, the year of his death². The history of his own time he wrote with the

bearing on Armenia and Cilicia were translated into Armenian by P. Ter-Pofosean and appeared in HA (1960).

1

Ibn al-Athīr, one of the world's greatest chroniclers, was born in 1160 and educated in Mosul. After completing his education, he travelled on missions for the prince of Mosul, to Syria and the Levant. Eventually he retired to devote himself to study. His Complete Chronology begins with Creation and ends in the year 1231 [C. Huart, A History of Arabic Literature (New York, 1903) p. 206]. The Complete Chronology was published in its entirety by Tornberg at Leyden in 1851-76 in fourteen volumes. Unfortunately, no complete translation exists, although some extracts in French translation were published in Recueil des historiens des Croisades: Hist. Orient, II, 1887, and M. Defremery has translated those passages concerning the Caucasus ["Fragments de Géographes et d'Historiens arabes et persans inédit", JA, 4th ser. #13 (1848), #14(1849)]

2

Bar Hebraeus (also known as Ibn al-'Ibri and Gregory Abu'l Faraj) was born into a Jewish family in the city of Melitene/Malatya on the Euphrates in 1225/26. As a child he studied Syriac, Arabic and probably Hebrew, and subsequently philosophy, theology, and medicine [The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj (Bar Hebraeus), E.A. Wallis Budge, trans. (London, 1932; repr. 1976) pp. xv-xvii]. In 1244 the Mongol general Shawer who had ravaged the Melitene/Malatya area employed the services of Bar Hebraeus' father, a physician. The family travelled with the Mongols to Karberd and thence to Antioch where Gregory at age 17 became a Syrian Monophysite Christian (Jacobite). After

authority of an eye-witness whose great clerical prestige gave him access to Mongol Khāns and Armenian royalty. His knowledge of the Syriac, Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Uighur, and (to some extent) Chinese languages placed him in a unique position to benefit from multi-lingual sources¹. The fact that he was a native of Melitene/Malatya is important, since he is always careful to note developments there, in the area around that city, and stretching eastward through the Armenian districts to the district surrounding Lake Van². Finally, as head of the Jacobite Church which was in communion with the Armenian Apostolic Church, Bar Hebraeus often conveys information about the Armenians and

several years of study, Bar Hebraeus was ordained bishop of one of the dioceses of Melitene/Malatya, ca. 1247, a position he occupied for some six or seven years (Budge, p. xvii). Thereafter he was appointed to the diocese of Aleppo, and, in 1264 he became Maphrian of the East, being ordained at Sis in Cilicia in the presence of the Armenian royal house and heads of the Jacobite and Armenian Churches (ibid. pp. xviii-xix). He then visited Abaqa-Khan, Hülegü's son, and was confirmed in his new position (ibid. p. xxi). During the next decade Bar Hebraeus was actively involved in quelling the numerous disputes which plagued his Church, and he frequently travelled between Cilicia, Maragheh in Azarbaijān and Melitene/Malatya (ibid. pp. xxi-xxiv). In 1281 Bar Hebraeus participated in the ordination of an Uighur monk, Yahbh-Allaha, to the catholicosate of the Jacobite Church. The next year he visited Ahmad-Khan and received new and greater authority. Upon his death in 1286, it was ordered by catholicos Yahbh-Allaha that the bazar of Maragheh be closed, and Bar Hebraeus was buried in that city with a large number of Armenians, Nestorians, Greeks and Jacobites participating in the services (ibid. p. xxx).

1
Budge, p. xvii.

2
ibid. pp. xviii-xix.

their Church¹. Considerably less important than Bar Hebraeus' work is Abu'l Fida's Universal History, an annal which reaches the year 1328². He based himself on former historians but also included original sections on the countries he had visited in person such as Syria, Egypt, parts of Arabia and Cappadocia as far as Caesarea³. The Universal History contains historical information on the emirs of Rūm and Syria, the rise of Georgia in the 12-13th centuries, Jalāl al-Dīn, on the latter's death, and on the Mongol invasions of Rūm. In addition, Abu'l Fida mentions the Armenian backgrounds of numerous Islamized officials in the various Middle Eastern countries in the 13-14th centuries.

1 The great value of Bar Hebraeus' Chronography was recognized during the author's own lifetime (Budge, pp.xxviii-xxix) when "foremost men among the Arabs asked him to turn the Chronography which he had composed in Syriac into the Saracenic (Arabic) language so that they also might read and enjoy it. To this the Maphrian agreed and straightway he began to turn the [book into Arabic] in noble and exceedingly eloquent language". A Latin translation of Bar Hebraeus' Arabic translation was published in 1663 by Pococke. The Syriac text of the Chronography published by Bedjan in 1890 was translated into English by E.A. Wallis Budge in 1932.

2 Abu'l Fida, the Arab historian and geographer was descended from the line of Saladin's father. Born in Damascus in 1273, he received a military and literary education, participating in a series of campaigns and wars. In 1310, the sultan Malik Nasr granted him the rule of Hamat, for his services against the sultan's adversaries Baibars and the Mongols. He died in 1333 after ruling Hamat for twenty years [C. Huart, op.cit., pp. 337-38]

3 Arabakan albyurnere Hayastani ev harevan erkrneri masin [Arabic Sources on Armenia and Neighboring Countries], H.T. Nalbandyan, trans. (Erevan, 1965) p. 211. Nalbandyan's

Two sources have been utilized in this study almost exclusively for economic and demographic details: the Geography of Yaqut al-Hamavi (completed in 1224 in Arabic)¹ and a treatise on taxation in the Īl-Khānid state (completed in 1340 in Persian), written by the Accountant-General (Mustawfi) of Iran, Hamd-Allah Qazvini². In addition to providing information of an economic nature, both help to clarify the changing territorial conceptions "Armenia" in the 13-14th centuries.

Armenian translation of those portions relevant to Armenia and surrounding areas is found in Arabakan... pp. 212-50, notes pp. 251-91. Standard French translations are by Reinaud (Paris, 1848) and S. Guyard (Paris, 1883).

1

Yaqut was born in 1178 into a Greek family of Asia Minor. Taken captive as a youth, he was sold in Baghdad to a Muslim merchant who saw to his education. He was sent on business for his master to numerous places. After his manumission in 1199, Yaqut visited Syria, Oman, Egypt, Tabriz, Aleppo and Mosul. In 1215 he travelled to Khurāsān and eventually to India. He was in Balkh when he heard of the Mongol conquests of Khiva and Bukhara. In 1220 he fled to Mosul where, in 1224 he completed his geographical work. He died in 1229 [EI vol. 4² p. 1153, "Yakut al-Rumi"; Arabakan... p. 5].

2

Qazvini's family, from the time of his great-grandfather, had held hereditarily the position of Mustawfi of Iran. Qazvini himself was trained in office-work relating to the taxation of the provinces, and served under the great historian and official Rashid al-Dīn [G. Le Strange, Mesopotamia and Persia under the Mongols in the Fourteenth Century A.D. (London, 1903) p. 5]. Le Strange's translation of Qazvini's treatise is The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat--al-Qulub of Hamd-Allah Mustawfi of Qazvin (London, 1919). Book III of the Nuzhat-al-Qulub provides priceless information about Azarbaijan, Mughan and Arran, Shirvan, Gurjistan (Georgia), Rum and Armenia. District by district, city by city the author usually explains what revenue had accrued

Accounts made by four 13-14th century travellers have importance both for military, political and economic history, and for the history of Armenia's lords. The first of the travellers considered is William of Rubruck. This French Franciscan friar visited and described various parts of the Caucasus in the period from November 17, 1254 to the beginning of April, 1255. Returning from a frustrating, wearying journey on behalf of king Louis IX of France to Sartakh-Khān who sent him to Batu, who sent him all the way to Mōngke-Khān in Qara-Qorum, Rubruck descended into the Caucasus to attend to some final business. He visited Darband, Tiflis, Shamākhī, Mūghān, Naxijewan, Ani, Kamax and Sebastia/Sīvās. Rubruck met and dined with the lord of Ani, Sahnšah Zak'arean. His remarks on Sahnšah, his observations of Armenian clerics in the Far East, and his accounts of Turco-Mongol nobles make the journal an invaluable source¹.

from a given area both in his own day, and in past times as well, providing a vivid picture of the general decline of the Il-Khanid state in the 14th century. In addition, Qazvini commented on the ruined condition of numerous cities and towns, the relative size and the trade of surviving cities, their noted religious sanctuaries, the types of crops grown in the countryside, and much more.

1

W.W. Rockhill, The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World 1253-55 (London, 1900).

Ibn Battuta (d. 1377), a Spanish Muslim traveller, visited Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor during 1333. For the most part travelling along the southern, western, and northern coasts of Asia Minor, Ibn Battuta also made a short excursion inland, visiting the describing the western Armenian cities of Sebastia/Sīvās, Erzinjan and Erzerum. The account is extremely valuable for 14th century Armenian social history, speaking about the presence of Turkmen bands on the highlands, the condition of cities, religious segregation and discrimination and the slave trade in Asia Minor¹. Battuta as a Muslim travelling in an officially Muslim country, presents a viewpoint not found among the Christian travellers.

The third traveller, a Bavarian Catholic soldier named Johann Schiltberger, was captured by the Ottoman sultan Bāyazīd in 1396 at the battle of Nicopolis when he was barely 16 years old. Following Bāyazīd's own capture by Tīmūr in 1402, Schiltberger became the property of Tīmūr whom he served until the year 1405 when he escaped and returned to Europe. The remarkable account of his adventures was dictated from memory by the author in German after his return home . Schiltberger visited the Armenian highlands

1

EI, new ed., vol. III, "Ibn Battuta" p. 735. On the dating of Battuta's excursion inland see H.A. R. Gibb, The Travels of Ibn Battuta, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1962) pp. 533-35.

at the beginning and toward the end of his captivity. He described the sites, events, and prominent personalities of Sebastia/Sīvās, Samson, Erzinjan, Xlat', Maku and Naxiĵewan during the times of Bāyazīd, Tīmūr and Tīmūr's son Shāhrukh. In addition he discoursed on the Apostolic religion of the Armenians, on St. Gregory (the Illuminator of Armenia), and on Graeco-Armenian tensions. He described his co-religionists, the Armenian Catholics of Naxiĵewan, in whom he apparently took much comfort and with whom he seems to have remained a sufficient amount of time to have picked up the unusual amount of lore found in his account. The book ends with the Lord's Prayer given in transliterated Armenian and Mongolian¹.

The fourth and final traveller considered is Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, whose Embassy to Tamerlane is a first-rate account of his three year journey as ambassador to king Henry III of Spain in 1403-1406 from Cadiz in Spain to Tīmūr-Khān in Samarqand, and back. Enroute to the East, Clavijo passed from Trebizond to Erzinjan to Erzerum, Surmari, Ararat, Maku and Khoy, frequently lodging in villages. On his return from Samarqand he visited

1

The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, J.B. Telfer, trans. (London, 1879).

Alashkert, Ani, and Sper. He commented on the condition of cities and of the countryside under Tīmūr's rule, on the tribulations of the Armenian governor of Erzinjan, on taxes, crypto-Christianity, on the massacres and deportations of Armenians in the late 14th and early 15th centuries, and on Turkmen, Tīmūrīd, and Ottoman warfare, frequently providing detailed historical excursuses¹.

The non-Caucasian sources tend to have different foci than the Caucasian. They were written by individuals lacking the patriotic feelings that motivated the Armenian historians. The history of the Turco-Mongol invasions could not be written without them, but for the history of Armenia's nobles in the 13-14th centuries, the Caucasian sources remain the most important. A discussion of these sources follows.

Armenian Sources

Kirakos Ganjakec'i and His History of Armenia

Kirakos Ganjakec'i was one of the most important Armenian historians of the 13th century. Biographical information about him is not plentiful. In chapter 33 of his work, after a description of the activities of the influential Syrian Raban, the author wrote: "This [episode] was written down

1

Clavijo, Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406, G. Le Strange, trans. (London, 1928).

in the year 1241/42 (690 A.E.)...when I was more or less forty years old"¹. Consequently the historian was born in the early part of the 13th century, probably between 1200 and 1210².

Kirakos received his early education at the monastery of Getik, at that time under the direction of a student of the great teacher and writer Mxit'ar Goš (d. 1213) named Martiros³. However, it was with another of Mxit'ar's students, the historian Yovhannēs Vanakan (d. 1251) that Kirakos studied for a prolonged period. This education commenced at Xoranašat monastery near Tawuš fortress, northwest of Ganjak⁴. When the Khwārazmian sultan Jalāl al-Dīn ravaged Xoranašat in 1225, Vanakan fled with his students to a nearby cave, near the village of Lorut, south of Tawuš⁵. He continued teaching there until 1236 when a Mongol army under Molar occupied Tawuš. Both Vanakan and Kirakos were taken captive by the Mongols and kept as secretaries for several months⁶. Vanakan eventually was ransomed by

¹ Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Patmut'iwn Hayoc' [History of Armenia] K.A. Melik'Öhanjanyan, ed. (Erevan, 1961), hereafter KG, ch. 33 p. 278: "i žamanaki kenac' meroc' ans k'afasun pakas kam aweli".

² See H. Oskean, "Kirakos Ganjakec'i" HA (1922) p. 89; Ališan, Hayapatum p. 216 specifies 1203.

³ KG ch. 17 p. 222.

⁴ KG ch. 15 p. 218.

⁵ KG ch. 23 pp. 243-44.

⁶ KG ch. 23 passim.

the Christians of Gag for 80 dahekans, and Kirakos escaped secretly the same night, fleeing to Getik¹.

Almost nothing is known about the remaining years of the historian's life. That he participated in the movement to crush a rebellion in the Church in 1251, is clear from chapter 48 of his work². Around 1255 he interviewed the Cilician Armenian king Het'um (1224-68) at the village of Vardenis near mt. Aragac upon the latter's return from a visit to Batu-Khān³. Kirakos' name is mentioned in 1265 by his classmate and fellow-historian Vardan Arewelc'i from whom the author requested and received a commentary on the Song of Songs⁴. According to another late 13th century historian, Grigor Aknerc'i, Kirakos died in 1271/72⁵.

¹ KG, chp. 23, p. 252; M. Abelyan, Collected Works, vol. 4 (Erevan, 1970) pp. 234-40. See Bibliography under Abelyan.

² KG, chp. 48, p. 327, and chp. 48 passim.

³ KG, chp. 58 p. 364, 371, 372. On the journey of Het'um see John Andrew Boyle, "The Journey of Het'um I, King of Little Armenia, to the Court of the Great Khan Mōngge", Central Asiatic Journal, 9(1964) pp. 175-89.

⁴ Oskean, op.cit., pp. 91-93.

⁵ Grigor Aknerc'i, History of the Nation of the Archers[HNA], R.Blake, trans., Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies(1949) #3-4 p. 379; Minor Chronicles, vol. 1 (Erevan, 1951) p. 44 See below under Chronographies.

Ganjakec'i's History of Armenia is a lengthy work in 65 chapters, written in a clear, simple style. It commences with the Christianization of Armenia and narrates events from Armenia's political and Church history, based on sources cited by the author¹. Since most of these sources have survived, the early portion of the History --albeit by no means devoid of interest--is less important than the section(beginning with chapter 11) wherein Kirakos describes events of his own day. The writer himself clearly was conscious of this fact². Kirakos was eminently qualified to write about 13th century Armenia. An intelligent man trained by an intellectual of Vanakan's caliber, the author was familiar with Church organization and problems, with prominent contemporary churchmen and their historical writings³. He was acquainted with important Armenian naxarars such as prince Pfoš Xalbakean, who participated in the Mongol conquest of Baghdad in 1258/59 and narrated to Kirakos what he had seen and heard, and prince Grigor Mamikonean, who informed Kirakos what he had heard from a Mongol noble about Chingiz-Khān⁴. His detailed

¹ KG, "Introduction", pp. 6-10.

² KG, chp. 20 p. 231.

³ Kirakos mentions his teacher Vanakan's now-lost work, KG, chp. 5 p. 178.

⁴ KG, chp. 60 p. 384;chp. 32 p. 272.

information about members of the Zak'arid family derives in part from Proš, himself a Zak'arid relation. As mentioned above, king Het'um I served as one informant. Furthermore, during his months of captivity by the Mongols Kirakos served as a secretary writing and reading letters¹, and he learned Mongolian². In chapter 32 of his History Kirakos Ganjakec'i has left us a priceless treasure, a lexicon of some 55 Mongolian terms with their Armenian equivalents, one of the earliest monuments of the Mongolian language³. Consequently, such an individual knew well not only the workings of his own society, but clearly understood aspects of the society of Armenia's conquerors and new masters.

We do not know when Kirakos began his work. Father Oskean, citing the aforementioned statement in chapter 33, "This was written down in the year 690 A.E. (=1241/42)..." thinks the year 1240 a likely time⁴. The History ends abruptly with an unfinished description of the war between

¹ KG, chp. 24 p. 249.

² KG, chp. 32 p. 274.

³ KG, chp. 32 p. 274. For an English translation and scholarly commentary on this chapter and lexicon see J.A. Boyle, "Kirakos of Ganjak on the Mongols", Central Asiatic Journal 8(1963) pp. 199-214, also L. Ligeti, "Le Lexique mongol de Kirakos de Gandzak" Acta Orientalia Hungarica XVIII(1965).

⁴ Oskean, op. cit., p. 216.

27

the Khāns Abaqa and Berke (1266/67). The cause of this sudden termination remains unknown¹.

Vardan Arewelc'i and His Compilation of History

Like Kirakos, Vardan is believed to have been born in 1200-1210. Nothing is known about his parents or family. One of his early teachers was Yovhannēs Vanakan (d. 1251), whom Vardan refers to in his History as "our glorious father" and whose now-lost historical work Vardan, like Kirakos, employed².

1

The critical edition of Ganjakec'i's History of Armenia was published by the late K.A. Melik'-Ohanjanyan in 1961. This text was based on 30 manuscripts housed at the Matenadaran in Erevan, Armenia, collated with the three earlier editions, those of Moscow [Patmut'iwn Hayoc' arareal Kirakosi Ganjakec'woy (The History of Armenia composed by Kirakos Ganjakec'i), Ostan Ter-Georgian-Yovhanniseanc' (Moscow, 1858), Venice, [L. Alisan, ed., (Venice, 1865)] and Tiflis, 1909. The latter is a reprint of the Moscow edition and is reviewed by N. Akinean in HA (1910), pp. 253-54. Complete translations were made in French by M. Brosset (St. Petersburg, 1870) Deux historiens arméniens, I, Kirakos de Gandzac; into Russian by L. A. Khanlarian, Kirakos Gandzaketsi, Istoriia Armenii (Moscow, 1976); and into English by the present writer. For the numerous translations see K. A. Melik'-Ohanjanyan. A full bibliography by H. Anasyan is appended to that work.

2

Vardan Arewelc'i, Hawak'umn patmut'ean Vardany vardapeti usabaneal (Venice, 1862) ch. 87 p. 146: "p'afaworeal hayrn mer Vanakan vardapetn...". Biographical information about Vardan called Arewelc'i (the Easterner), Aluanic' (from Albania), Ganjakec'i and "the Great", is found in the History of his classmate and good friend Kirakos Ganjakec'i, in Vardan's own works, and in Grigor Aknerc'i's History. Scholars in elucidating the few facts known about Vardan sometimes have confused him with other Vardans living in

Around 1239-40, Vardan visited Jerusalem on a pilgrimage and then went to Cilicia, ca. 1240-41 where he was received very favorably by king Het'um I and the reigning kat'olikos Constantine Barjraberdc'i (1220-68)¹. Kirakos Ganjakec'i states that the kat'olikos entrusted Vardan with an encyclical which the latter brought back to eastern Armenia for the signatures of the somewhat reluctant bishops, monks, and princes. Presumably Vardan visited most of these dignitaries in person, a journey which would have taken him from Karin/Erzerum to Ani, Kars, Bjni, Amberd, Halbat, Sanahin, Getik, Halarcin, Keçaru, Hawuc' T'ar, Ayrivank' (Gelard), Yovhanhavank', Salmosavank', Horomos, to Albania, to his teacher

the same period. Father M. Čamčan [Patmut' iwn Hayoc' skzbane asxarhi minčew zam teafn 1784 est awandeloj avlavl matenagrac] (History of the Armenians from the Creation of the World to A.D. 1784 According to the Accounts of Diverse Sources 3 vols. (Venice, 1784-86) vol. 3 p. 240] and J. Emin [Mkrtič (Joseph) Emin, first to publish the Armenian text entitled it Mecin Vardanay Barjraberdc'woy patmut' iwn tiezerakan (Universal History of the Great Vardan Barjraberdc' i) (Moscow, 1861)] made the same mistake. However the error was not made by the publishers in the forward of the second edition (Venice, 1862) p. 11. See M. Abelyan, Works, vol. 4, p. 240, and H. Oskean, "Vardan Arewelc' i", HA (1921) p. 365.

1

KG ch. 41 p. 294. Father Oskean considers it likely that Vardan participated in the Council of Sis in 1243, called to settle Church disputes (Oskean, p. 368). While in Cilicia, Vardan made the acquaintance of a Syrian priest named Isox, with whom he translated into Armenian Michael the Syrian's Chronology, ca. 1246 (Oskean, pp. 569-70. On the numerous other works attributed to Vardan see Oskean, pp. 461-69, 564-72.

Venakan, and to the prince of princes Awag Zak'arean¹.
 Vardan then sent the signed document back to the kat'-
 olikos².

In 1264/65 a merchant named Snorhawor took Vardan
 to see Hülegü-Khān who deeply honored the great scholar³.
 Sometime in 1266 Vardan's History was stolen, the work
 still unfinished. However one and a half years later
 he was able to retrieve it⁴. Vardan spent his last years

¹ KG ch. 43 p. 310.

² ibid p. 311. Çamçean, followed by L. Ališan incorrectly
 supposed that Vardan personally took the encyclical back
 to Cilicia (Oskean, op. cit., p. 369). After discharging
 the kat'olikos' request, Vardan went to his retreat called
 Andre near Kayean fortress where he taught and wrote (KG
 ch. 43 p. 311). He also lived six years at Xořvirap where
 he had 40 pupils, then at Sałmosavank' and Hafiča monasteries
 (Oskean, pp. 369-70). See also H. Manandian and Hř. Ačafean
Hayoc' nor vkanere [Armenian Neo-martyrs], (Vałaršapat, 1903)
 p. 105.

³ VA ch. 96 pp. 155-58.

⁴ VA ch. 97 p. 167.

at Halbat and Xofvirap¹. According to Grigor Aknerc'i, he died in 1271/72, the same year as his friend Kirakos².

Vardan made use of Kirakos Ganjakec'i's History of Armenia³. He derived another source of his information

1 Oskean, op.cit., pp. 370-71.

2 GA p. 379. Oskean thinks that Vardan was buried at Xofvirap (Oskean, p. 373).

3 VA ch. 87 p. 146. Vardan's Compilation of History belongs to the genre of "universal histories" popular among medieval Armenian authors. It commences with Adam and terminates with the death of Vardan's personal friend kat'olikos Constantine in 1268. It is not known when the author started writing the History. While Vardan tends to concentrate on the history of Armenia, the early portion of his work also speaks about the rulers of Israel, Greece, Persia, and Arabia. As a result of his attempt to abridge so much of Middle Eastern history, Vardan's style suffers. The list-like presentations of names and the extraneous repetitions in the early section of his work make it tiresome reading. Sources for the period before his own include the Bible and Biblical traditions, plus most of the same Armenian historians utilized by Kirakos Ganjakec'i. Unlike Kirakos, however, Vardan rarely cites his sources. This is a consequence not of the author's desire to conceal this information or to claim it as his own, but simply because these sources would have been immediately recognized by readers. As Vardan approaches his own period, the information becomes more significant. This is especially true of his narration of 11th and 12th century events, since apparently he made use of works now lost, such as Yovhannes Sargawag's History of the Saljuqs.

from personal acquaintance with the principals of the day. As was mentioned above, the erudite Vardan, praised as "the learned and brilliant vardapet"¹ by his classmate Kirakos was a valued friend both of king Het'um I of Cilicia, and of the kat'olikos. Kirakos wrote: "He went to the kat'olikos [Constantine] who rejoiced exceedingly at his sight. The kat'olikos kept [Vardan] with him for a long time, binding the latter to himself with affection, for he never wanted him to depart"². When Vardan took the kat'olikos' encyclical East for ratification, he visited all the important Church and lay personalities of the period. In addition to his intimacy with prominent Armenians, Vardan was personally acquainted with the Mongol Īl-Khān Hūlegū (1255-65) and his Christian wife Doquz-Khātun³. The account

1 KG ch. 41 p. 294: "zimastun ew zhančarež vardapetn zVardan...".

2 ibid.: "žogaw ew af kat'olikosn, zor teseal` uraxac'aw voyž, ew af iwr paheal volov žamanaks, sirov kapeal end nma, zi of.kamer erbek meknil i nmane".

3 Vardan attended the Mongol New Year celebration in Iran in 1265/66 at Hūlegū's invitation. According to his own account of his audience with Hūlegū, Vardan, as an honored cleric was not required to bow. He agreed to bless the Khan's wine (VA ch. 96 p. 156). Hūlegū later drew Vardan aside and by means of interpreters urged him to criticize and advise freely and fearlessly (ibid. p. 157). Vardan was given a patent of authority (yarligh) and was promised an audience again, the following year, though Hūlegū had died before it took place. "However, [Hūlegū's Christian wife] the great queen Tołuz-Khātun prior to announcing Hūlegū's death, secretly sent to me, saying: 'God loved the Īl-Khan and took him away. What-ever he loved here and gave to this world will be given to him in the next. Should there be a mass or not?'... She also inquired regarding Abaqa, Hūlegū's senior son,

of a man enjoying such authority among his own people and their foreign overlords is of exceptional importance¹.

Step'annos Orbēlean's History of the State of Sisakan

Step'annos Orbēlean, metropolitan of the district of Siwnik' in eastern Armenia (1285/86-1303/4) was the House historian of the illustrious Orbēlean family². The

whether it was proper to enthrone him, for he had not converted [to Christianity] (VA, ch. 97 pp. 160-61)".

1

Vardan's History is important too from the standpoint of language. Written in a somewhat vulgar form of classical Armenian, occasionally we see evidence of the emergence of the um ending typical of later modern eastern Armenian. See Abe'yan, pp. 245-46. Regrettably, no critical edition of Vardan's History exists. The Armenian text has been published twice: by J. Emin (Moscow, 1861) and by the Venetian Mxit'arists in 1862. The latter edition is based on a ms. made in 1307. Among the 8 or 9 remaining mss. of the History, one recopied in 1631 was based on a ms. dated 723 A.E. (=1274/75), only three years after Vardan's death (VA, p. xi; Oskean, pp. 460-61). The History was translated in full into Russian by Emin (Moscow, 1861). A partial Russian translation was made by K. Patkanov (St. Petersburg, 1873, vol. 1, pp. 1-29). Partial French translations appeared in Journal Asiatique (1860 fas. II) and in Recueil des historiens des Croisades; Documents arméniens I (Paris, 1869) pp. 431-43 made by E. Dulaurier. An English translation of chapters 82-100 (pp. 138-64 of the Venice, 1862 ed.) was made by the present writer.

2

The Orbēleans, apparently a branch of the once-influential Mamikonean house, removed to southern Georgia from Armenia in the second half of the 9th century. Centered at the fortress of Orbeti in the Samšvilde area, this family, like its presumed Armenian Mamikonid relations in Armenia, held the often hereditary office of commander-in-chief (spaspeti) of the Georgian army in the 11th and 12th centuries [C. Toumanoff, "The Mamikonids and the Liparitids", Armeniaca (Venice, 1969), p. 125. Step'annos Orbelean, Patmut' iwn Nahankin Sisakan (History of the State of Sisakan), Karapet Sahnazareanc', ed. (Paris, 1859) chp. 66 passim. Hereafter SO].

year of Step'annos' birth is not known. Some scholars believe that he was born in 1250-60, basing themselves on his statement that he was ordained a priest in 1280/81, and probably would have been between 25 and 30 years of age at that time¹. Step'annos received a clerical education and became successively a scribe (dpir), deacon, and priest². In 1285/86 his father sent him to Cilicia, where "on Easter day they ordained Step'annos the metro-

However, in 1177, as a result of the implication of the Orbeleans in an abortive rebellion against king Georgi III, the Georgian Crown exterminated all members of the clan, excepting two brothers who escaped (SO, chp. 66 pp. 128-35). One brother, Iwane, succeeded in restoring part of his family's holdings in Georgia during the reign of queen Tamar (1184-1213) (*ibid.* p. 136). Descendants of the other brother, Elikum, eventually gained control of all Siwnik' (SO, chp. 66 pp. 143-44, 167-69, "from Balk' to Ayrarat and from the gate of Barkusat to the borders of Bjni"). As a consequence of speedy submission to the Mongols, the Orbeleans, then headed by Elikum's grandson Smbat, not only retained their lands, but also extended them (SO, p. 150, 158). When Smbat's brother and successor Tarsayiç died in 1290, Orbelean control over Siwnik' was stronger than ever: Tarsayiç's son Elikum became the secular lord of the principedom, while our author Step'annos, Tarsayiç's other son, firmly exercised the spiritual authority (SO, p. 179).

1

SO, chp. 66 p. 174; T. X. Hakobyan, S.T. Melik'-Baxşyan, Step'anos Orbelyan (Erevan, 1960) p. 26. Also G.M. Grigoryan, "Step'anos Orbelyan", PBH 4(1976) p. 155. Some controversy exists about his mother. In chapter 66 of the History Step'annos wrote about his father Tarsayiç: "He had taken a wife from among the Ishmaelites, Aruz xat'un, daughter of the lord of Siwnik'; she became a Christian and [displayed] venerable faith and fear of God..." (SO, chp. 66 p. 162). Subsequently, in chapter 71 he stated that he was descended on his mother's side "from [the line of] Sisak" and was an Orbelean on his father's side (SO, chp. 71, p. 226). If both statements are correct, i.e., that Aruz was both a Muslim and of the indigenous Armenian line of Sisak, it is possible that his mother had been an Islamized Armenian.

2

SO, chp. 66 p. 166. M. Abelyan, vol. 4 pp. 250-51.

politan of the great see of Siwnik', above all the other bishops here and there, some in Vayoc' Jor and some in Tat'ew"¹. He returned home in 1287/88². After a protracted struggle with rebellious bishops³, he managed to assert his control over the prelacies of Tat'ew and Noravank, and then commenced industriously rennovating the ruined and dilapidated churches and monasteries under his jurisdiction⁴.

1 SO, chp. 66 p. 174: "Ew i meci awur Zatkın jernadren zStep'annos metropolit mec at ofovn Siwneac i veray ayloc' episkoposac n or kayın ast ew and, omank i Vayoc' jor ew omank i Tat'ew...".

2 ibid. p. 175.

3 ibid. pp. 175-76.

4 SO, chp. 63 p. 90. Information on these activities is found not only in the History but in the numerous extant inscriptions the new metropolitan had carved on his construction projects themselves (Divan Hay Vimagrut'yan (Corpus of Armenian Inscriptions) vol. 3 (Erevan, 1966) [CIA vol.3] pp. 208, 215, 220, 222, 238, etc. It should be noted too that many other inscriptions which have survived in a damaged state both from Step'annos' time and from earlier periods have been reconstructed thanks to the scholarly Step'annos who frequently incorporated their complete texts into his History. See H.A.Orbeli, CIA vol.1 (Erevan, 1966) p. XI, G.M.Grigoryan, op.cit., p. 161. Speaking of Siwnik' in the early 1290's under the rule of his brother Elikum and himself, Step'annos declared: "Now because in this period the whole land was ruined and corrupted and worship had been obstructed in the monasteries, everyone universally applied to this lordship [Siwnik'] finding a haven here. [Among the applicants were] the kat'olikos of Albania, lord Step'annos who came and dwelled with his [spiritual] brother lord Step'annos [the author], many other bishops, vardapets, and azats. By the grace of God, this tun[House] was a sight to behold, like unto Noah's ark amidst the world-destroying waves..." (SO, chp. 66 p. 178). In the late 1290's and early 1300's, Step'annos was active as the leader of the eastern Armenian clergy in resisting the Latinophile policies of the Cilician kat'olikos

In chapter 73 of the History the author states that he completed his work in the year 1299 during the reign of Ghazan-Khān, son of Arghun¹. For the early portion of the History, Step'annos used many of the sources used by Kirakos and Vardan; however, he also employed histories and sources unused by other writers such as the sermons of the fifth century Petros Siwnik', and the history of Maštoc' of Sewan². He frequently quotes directly from now-lost kat'olikosal encyclicals, letters from kat'oliki to the bishops of Siwnik' and responses to them, edicts, Church property documents, inscriptions, colophons and old letters of Armenian and Siwnik' monarchs and the princes of Siwnik'. Step'annos knew Georgian, and used the History of K'art'li. He may have known Persian as

Grigor Anawarzec'i (SO, chp. 68-69). Step'annos' tombstone at Noravank' monastery indicates 1303/4 as the year of his death (CIA, vol. 3 p. 233).

1

SO, chp. 73 pp. 256-57. The History of the State of Sisakan is not Step'annos' sole surviving work. For a list of the others see Grigoryan, op.cit., p. 157, also M. Abelyan, vol. 4, pp. 257-71. In part, apparently, Step'annos was motivated to undertake this project by feelings of family pride. He complains that while other families which played a prominent role in Armenian affairs --such as the Mamikonean, Bagratuni, and Arcruni-- all had their noteworthy deeds put into writing, the House of Sisak and its successors (the Orbeleans) lacked a recorded history (SO, chp. 1 p. 47; chp. 5 pp. 56-57).

2

Agat'angelos, SO chp. 7 p. 64, chp. 9 p. 71; Lazar and Eise, chp. 18 p. 104; Zenob, chp. 5 p. 58; Lewond, chp. 7 p.64; Movses Xorenac'i, chp. 6 p. 63; John Kat'olikos, chp. 26 p. 148; Uxtanes, chp. 25 p. 142, chp. 26, p. 149; History of Albania, chp. 26 p. 149, chp.52, p. 22; Mxit'ar of Ani, chp. 66 p. 118; Book of Letters, chp. 26, p. 149. Petros Siwnik' chp. 1 p. 48, chp. 10 pp. 78-79 and elsewhere; Maštoc' of Sewan, chp. 34 p. 204.

well¹. In chapter 3 he provides a unique but regrettably corrupt geographical description of the 12 districts of Siwnik', and in chapter 74 he furnishes a long list of the taxes paid to the Church by these districts².

The already extremely great importance of this History is increased yet more when Step'annos speaks of his own times. As the educated son of the former lord of Siwnik', Tarsayiç, and as the brother of the ruling lord Elikum, Step'annos was in a position to know intimately all the important noble personalities and events of that state and in Armenia generally. Similarly, his knowledge of Georgian and the existence of a powerful Georgian branch of his own family doubtlessly made him privy to information unavailable to many Armenian historians regarding events in Georgia. As metropolitan of Siwnik' he had jurisdiction over all churches and monasteries located there. Furthermore, he had numerous highly placed acquaintances and enjoyed their respect. In chapter 66 where the author described his trip

1

On Step'annos' use of old documents: SO chp. 1 p. 49, chp. 8 p. 67, chp. 23; chp. 36 p. 208; chp. 43 pp. 278-79; chp. 57 pp. 52-53, chp. 73 pp. 254-55, and elsewhere. His knowledge of Georgian: SO chp. 66 p. 133 and use of the History of K'art'li chp. 66 p. 118. His possible knowledge of Persian: chp. 70 p. 219.

2

On the tax list see G.M. Grigoryan, "Dramakan haraberut'-yunneri zargac'ume Syunik'um ev St.Orbelyani harkac'uc'aki xndire [The Development of Money Relationships in Siwnik' and the Question of St. Orbelean's Tax List]" Lraber 2(1966) pp. 45-57.

to Cilicia, he wrote:

...But when Step'annos arrived there, the kat'oiikos [Yakob] had died. Lewon, king of Armenia, received him with great honor and glory and greatly entreated him to remain there and to occupy the kat'oiikosal throne. Step'annos did not consent to this...1.

He was personally acquainted with three Mongol Khāns, Arghun, Geikhatu, and Ghazan, all of whom esteemed this important dignitary and quickly granted his requests². Consequently, Step'annos was uniquely qualified to write an authoritative history of his country and his times³.

1

SO, chp. 66 p. 174: "Or ew i hasaneln and, varčaneal er kat'oiikosn, ew bazum patiw ew mecameç p afs enduner i t agaworen Hayoc Lewone or ew yolov t axanjans afner nma mnal anden ew nstel yat'of kat'oiikosut ean Hayoc'. Ew minç of afnoyr yanjn ...".

2

SO, chp. 66 p. 176; chp. 71 p.230; chp. 71 p. 231.

3

Unfortunately no critical edition of the History of the State of Sisakan exists. The Armenian text was published first by Karapet Sahnazareanc' (Paris, 1859). Two years later J.Émin issued an edition in Moscow based on two mss. which he compared with the Sahnazareanc' text. The third printing occurred in Tiflis, 1910 in the Lukasean Library Series, and is a reprint of the Paris text with the addition of an index. A full French translation in two volumes was issued by M. Brosset (St.Petersburg, 1864-66; Histoire de la Siounie, par Stephannos Orbelian). Translations of individual chapters have been made into Russian by K. Patkanov and A.G. Galstyan[see Bibliography]; French by M.S.Saint-Marten[Memoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie, t.II(Paris, 1819)]; and English by the present writer.

Grigor Aknerc'i's History of the Nation of the Archers[HNA]

Very little is known about the author of this work which treats the 44 year period from 1229/30 to 1273. He is presumed to have been born in Cilicia around 1250¹. Nothing is known about his parents, although by his own testimony Grigor did have a brother Mxit'ar who had died by the time Grigor completed his work². A colophon dated 1312/13 speaks of Grigor as the abbot of Akner monastery in Cilicia³. Father Nersēs Akinean places his death around 1335⁴.

1 Nersēs Akinean, "Grigor k'ahanay Aknerc'i patmagir T'at'arac' Patmut'ean 1250-1335[Grigor the Priest of Akner, Historian of the History of the T'at'ars]", HA (1948) p.387.

2 ibid. p. 387 n.1.

3 Nersēs Akinean, "Akanc' kam Akneri vank'e[Akanc' or Akner Monastery], HA (1948) p. 237.

4 Akinean, "Grigor k'ahanay", pp. 389-90. HNA is contained in ms. 32 housed at the library of the monastery of St. James in Jerusalem. Ms. 32 commences with the Armenian translation of the Chronography of Michael the Syrian (done by Vardan Arewelc'i in 1246) which concludes with the events of 1195. The Chronography is followed by a continuation made by the Armenian translator or some other person which briefly comments on the period 1216-1229. This section is succeeded by a colophon of the copyist Grigor Aknerc'i, which states that the latter completed his copy of the above portions in 1273, and then adds: "...by the grace of God we too shall write what is lacking from it for 44 years"(GA, Introduction, p. 272). This is followed immediately by Grigor's HNA which the author apparently saw as a continuation of the chronologies he had been copying. At the end of the History, Grigor stated: "In the year 720 A.E. (=1271/72) these chronographies were written by the command of the blessed, glorious father

The HNA differs from the works of other Armenian historians thus far described. First, as the product of a Cilician author in his early 20's when the work was completed in 1273, this history lacks the immediacy found in the compilations of eastern Armenian eye-witnesses to the Mongol conquest and domination, such as Kirakos, Vardan, and Step'annos. This circumstance probably accounts for some of the chronological inaccuracies committed by Grigor in the early portion of his work. On the other hand, as Blake observed, "The writer had one advantage over his more gifted contemporary [Kirakos]: he was not immediately exposed to the impact of the invaders..."¹. A second difference between Grigor's work and the histories of Kirakos, Vardan, and Step'annos concerns the scope of his undertaking. Aknerc'i wrote a relatively short history of a 44 year period. Far from being a universal history

Step'annos of this retreat of Akanc' with the consent of Vardan, warden of the holy retreat, and of the entire brotherhood of priests and clerics, by the hand of the miserable scribe Grigor, servant of the Word..."(Akinean, "Grigor k'ahanay", p. 390, also R.Blake, GA, Introduction, pp. 281-82 n.6). All publications of the Armenian text and all translations of it prior to the issuance of R.Blake's text and English translation have incorrectly named a certain vardapet Malakia as the author. Two scholars, H.Zamkoçyan and Nerses Akinean independently established Grigor of Akner as the true writer[Akinean, "Grigor k'ahanay"; Zamkoçyan, "The Author of the Work HNA"(in Arm.)Scientific Works of the State University of Erevan 23(1946) pp. 367-68].Malakia it was revealed, was none other than the 17th century vardapet Malakia T'oxat'ec'i who had recopied Grigor's work and whose own colophon gave rise to this confusion.

1

For example, Grigor incorrectly dates the first appearance of the Mongols in the Caucasus to 1214, years earlier than other historians (GA, p. 294/95); the defeat of Ghiyath

of Armenia, the author focussed on but two principal arenas, Greater Armenia and Cilicia, and he devoted considerable space to 13th century Cilicia. A third important difference is that clearly Grigor was not a well-educated or deep individual. His frequent lapses into fantasy jeopardize the credibility of other information for which he is our only source.

What were Aknerc'i's sources of information?

Fr. Akinean observed a number of them. Apparently among the most important were oral accounts of events provided by Armenian visitors to Akner monastery such as Dawit' Bĵnec'i, Kirakos Getikc'i, and king Het'um I, people who either were from the East, or had travelled there¹. One informant in Akinean's opinion, had been a student of Vanakan vardapet². It was from such informed individuals

al-Dīn in 1244 is recorded as occurring in 1239 (p.306/7); Arghun's census of 1253/54 is consigned to 1251/52 by Grigor. Zamkočyan noted that for the post-1249 period, Grigor is generally accurate (Zamkočyan, op.cit., p.388). Blake's statement, GA, Introduction, p. 269.

1 Akinean, "Grigor k'ahanay", p. 399.

2 ibid. p. 400. To Akinean, Grigor definitely was not a pupil of Vanakan nor the classmate of Vardan and Kirakos. Thus the statement found at the end of chapter 9: "In those days the senior glorious vardapet, our Vanakan, passed to Christ leaving us in great grief, not only those of us who had studied with him, but the entire land..." (GA, p. 322/23) in Akinean's opinion was made by such an informant to Grigor, not by the author himself.

that Grigor learned the meanings of the large number of Mongolian military and juridical terms which he incorporated into the History¹. Akinean also detected a few written sources, including the Bible, a commentary on the Names of the Hebrews, the Chronography of Michael the Syrian, and the lengthy colophon of Vardan Arewelc'i (1246) providing a legendary geneology of the Mongols, which Grigor incorporated into his own work with few alterations². It is also possible, as Akinean and Blake suggested, that Grigor may have had access to Vanakan's now-lost history³.

1 Akinean, "Grigor k'ahanay", 400.

2 ibid. pp. 401-2.

3 ibid. p. 403; Blake, GA, Introduction, pp. 274-76. The Armenian text of the HNA first was published in 1870 at Jerusalem based on the oldest extant ms. (#32 of the Patriarchal Library of St. James, Jerusalem) dated 1271, and another ms. dated 1602 [Nšxark' hay matenagrut'ean patmut' iwn T'atarac' Vardani patmči haneal i jefagir orinakac (Fragments of Armenian Literature: Vardan the Historian's History of the T'atars, printed from manuscript copies) (Jerusalem, 1870)]; See also N. Akinean's review of Blake's translation in HA (1955) p. 274]. Also in 1870 K. Patkanean published the Armenian text in St. Petersburg based on a Venice ms. of 1624 [Malak'ia Abelavi patmut' iwn yasn azgin nstolac' (Malak'ia the Monk's HNA)]. The following year Patkanean published a Russian translation [Istoriia Mongolov inoka Magakii (Malak'ia the Monk's History of the Mongols)]. The History previously had been translated into French by Brosset in 1851 [based on the Venice ms. dated 1624. Ouvrage de Malakia-Abégha, ou Malakia-le-Moine, in M. Brosset's Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie (St. Petersburg, 1851) pp. 438-67]. The Armenian text, compared with all previous editions accompanied by an English translation was printed in vol. 12 of the Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies #3-4(1949) pp. 269-443.

T'ovma Mecop'ec'i's History of Tamerlane and His Successors

Information about this author is found in T'ovma's own History¹, in the Life of T'ovma Mecop'ec'i² written

Appearing in the same journal was Francis Woodman Cleaves' important article, "The Mongolian Names and Terms in the History of the Nation of the Archers by Grigor of Akanc'" (pp. 400-444). Subsequently, in 1954, Blake's text and translation and Cleaves' article were reprinted together in book form [History of the Nation of the Archers (the Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc', hitherto ascribed to Malak'ia the Monk, the Armenian text edited with an English translation and notes by Robert P. Blake and Richard N. Frye (Cambridge, Mass., 1954)]. Blake's translation, without a doubt a great contribution to Armenian and Mongol studies, nonetheless has a number of inaccuracies. Some of these are due to typographical errors, others to the scholar's unfamiliarity with certain conventions in classical Armenian and with Armenian place names. The most serious of these mistakes have been identified in Akinean's review of the publication (HA, 1955, pp. 275-77). Here we point out three such errors as a caution that Blake's work must be used in conjunction with the studies of Akinean and Zamkoçyan:

Blake

zMcobnay berd "the citadel of Nisibis" (chp.3 p.297 l 65).
zNorberdn, "the new fortress" (chp.3 p.297 l 67).
yurdgahs, "royal tent" (chp. 6 p. 313, l 74).

Should Read

zMacnaberd (=Macnaberd, a fortress near Ganjak).
zNorberdn (=Norberd, a fortress near Tawuș).
yurdgahs (ordugah, "camp").

1

Patmut' iwn Lank-T'amuray ew vajordac' iwroc', arareal T'ovma vardapeti Mecobec woy, [The History of Tamerlane and His Successors by vardapet T'ovma Mecobec i], K. Sahnazar-ean, ed. (Paris, 1860). Hereafter TM.

2

This work was published in Armenian twice by Garegin Yovsep'ean: "New Materials for the Biography of T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, 1376-1447", Ararat (1913) pp. 738-67, 1151-61; (1914) pp. 67-84; and as a separate book with the same title (Valarsapat, 1914). The Life is available in a Russian translation, Pamiatniki Armianskoj Agiografii [Monuments of Armenian Hagiography] K'.S. Ter-Davt'yan, trans. and ed., (Erevan, 1973) pp. 157-63.

by his student Kirakos Banasēr (the Philologist)¹, and in a number of 15th century colophons. According to these sources, T'ovma was born in 1378² in the district of Akiovit, north of Lake Van. He received his early education at the monastery of Mecop' north of Arčēš, but the invasions of Tamerlane and the attacks of Turkmen bands obliged him to move from place to place, frequently fleeing for his life. In 1395 he went to Suxara (Xafabasta) monastery in the K'aĵberunik' district of southern Armenia where he studied for 12 years with the noted vardapets Sargis and Vardan³. In 1406 together with 12 classmates, he went to one of the most important seats of learning in Armenia, the monastery of Tat'ew in the Ćluk region of Siwnik'⁴. After a residence of only two years there, T'ovma, his classmates and their teacher, the great intellectual Grigor Tat'ewac'i were forced to flee to Mecop' monastery to escape the Qara Qoyunlu Turkmens⁵.

1 V.Hakobyan, Minor Chronicles of the XIII-XVIII Centuries, vol. I (Erevan, 1921) pp. 113-14 (See Bibliography) suggests that Kirakos Banaser and Kirakos Rstuni, compiler of a chronicle are the same individual.

2 L.Xaĉikyan, compiler, XV Dari hayeren jeragreri hišatak-aranner [Colophons of XVth Century Armenian Manuscripts] vol. I (Erevan, 1955) p. 567; see also Ter-Davt'yan, op. cit., p. 152 n.6.

3 Yovsēp'yan, op.cit., Foreword, p. 5; Ter-Davt'yan, p.152.

4 L. Xaĉikyan, p. 101.

5 ibid.

Soon thereafter T'ovma's beloved teacher was taken to the Ayrarat district by other students and T'ovma who set out after him with his classmates was unable to convince him to return¹. According to Kirakos Banasēr, Grigor Tat'ewac'i conferred the vardapetal dignity on T'ovma in Erewan². T'ovma then returned to Mecop' where he engaged in teaching and literary activity. However between 1421 and 1437 southern Armenia once again became a theater of warfare between Turkmens, Mongols, and Kurds. In 1430 T'ovma fled for his life to the island of Lim in Lake Van. In 1436 he and his students fled to Xlat', Arčēs and Arckē³. T'ovma Mecop'ec'i was one of the major protagonists involved in transferring the Armenian kat'ol-ikogate from Sis back to Eĵmiacin in 1441⁴. After the realization of his dream, T'ovma returned to his beloved Mecop' where he died three years later, in 1446⁵.

1 L. Xačikyan, op.cit., p. 101.

2 Ter-Davt'yan, p. 154.

3 TM, pp. 83, 85, 87-89, 90-95, 108-109.

4 T'ovma described this in his other surviving work, T'ovma Mecop'ec'u Yišatakarane [T'ovma Mecop'ec'i's Colophon] K.Kostanean, ed. (Tiflis, 1892).

5 Ter-Davt'yan, p.157.

The History of Tamerlane and His Successors, although the major source for Armenia in the late 14th and early 15th centuries, is, nonetheless a rather defective production. Written for the most part from memory, the work especially when dealing with events occurring outside of Armenia, contains historical inaccuracies and frequent repetitions, jumps episodically back and forth from one decade to another, and does not, generally seem to be a well-structured history¹. T'ovma himself was well aware of its shortcomings. He wrote: "This [referring to the martyrdom of four vardapets] occurred in 1425/26 more or less. You must excuse me, for I was old and commenced after 50 years [of age]. Therefore I wrote going backward and forward (yet ew yara] grec 'i)"².

The History commences with the devastations wreaked on Siwnik' by the northern Tatars in 1386. Tamerlane's invasions of 1387, 1388, 1395, 1401, and 1402 on numerous districts of eastern and western Armenia and Georgia are described with the blood-curdling immediacy of a terrified eye-witness. The account is more detailed yet for the

¹ M. Abeġyan, vol. 4, pp. 417-20.

² TM, p.44

first three decades of the 15th century. It describes the impact on Armenian economic, intellectual and religious life of this dismal and nightmarish period of mass exterminations, mass deportations, and the forced and voluntary apostasy of the population¹.

Chronographies and Hagiographical Literature

In addition to the longer literary histories reviewed above, a number of chronographical works and medieval martyrdoms also are important for an examination of the invasions and the lords of the 13-14th centuries. Of the chronographies, some are rather extensive, lengthy works, others are quite short. The more lengthy works include Samuēl of Ani's Chronography, Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i's Chronology and Smbat Sparapet's Chronicle. Samuēl, the first of the three was a 12th century cleric from Ani whose chronicle ends in 1179/80². However, for the purposes of this study,

1

Unfortunately no critical edition of T'ovma's work exists. The Armenian text was published by K. Sahnazarean in Paris in 1860. I have not seen the modern Armenian translation by A. Ter-Yovhanniseanc' (Jerusalem, 1873). Subsequently the classical text was translated into French by Felix Neve and published twice: first in JA (1855) pp. 221-81; second as a separate book in 1861. Sahnazarean's Armenian text was translated into English by the present writer.

2

Almost nothing is known about the author of this chronicle. In his list of source, Kirakos Ganjakec'i mentions him as "Samuel the priest of the cathedral of Ani" (KG p. 8). Vardan Arewelc'i, recalling noteworthy Armenian clerics of the 12th century speaks of "Samuel, presbyter of the land, Anec'i, who compiled a chronicle" (VA ch. 69 p. 121). In the body

more important even than Samuēl's own work are the anonymous continuations made by a number of subsequent writers, covering the periods 1179/80-1304/5 and 1257--1424/25¹. Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i's Chronology extends from Biblical times to the year 1289 and, as Samuēl's work, provides details on political, military, and socio-economic matters, confirming or amplifying what is known from other sources². Smbat Sparapet's Chronicle (the Royal Chronicle) was compiled by the influential brother of Cilician king

of his own work Samuēl claims to have been an eye-witness to the capture of Ani by Georgian king Georgi in 1161/62, Samuēl k'ahanavi Anec'woy hawak'munk' i' groc' patmagrac' [Samuel the Priest of Ani's Collection of Historians' Writings], Arsak Ter-Mik'elian, ed. (Vaharsapat, 1893)p.137. Other biographical details are lacking. In the opinion of Ter-Mik'elian, editor of a semi-critical edition of the text, Samuel may have been born around 1100, dying around 1190 (SA, Introduction, p. 6).

1

Ter-Mik'elian's edition was based on the approximately 13 manuscripts now housed at the Matenadaran in Erevan, Armenia, yet the editor noted the existence of other unused copies in Venice and Paris (SA, Introduction, p. 24). He believed that all copies stemmed from a single exemplar. None of the manuscripts predate the 17th century, and all are to a greater or lesser degree corrupt (ibid. pp. 7-24). In preparing his edition, Ter-Mik'elian made two useful alterations in Samuel's work. He eliminated all calendrical systems found in that work except the Armenian, which proved to be the most accurate, and arranged the historical information as separate entries placed to the right of the date. Samuel of Ani's chronicle was translated into French by M. Brosset, Collection d'historiens Arméniens (St. Petersburg, 1876) vol. II pp. 340-483.

2

Almost nothing is known about Mxit'ar. See Manandyan, Critical... vol. 3 p. 372. The French translation is by M. Brosset, Histoire chronologique par Mkhithar d'Airivank (St. Petersburg, 1869).

Het'um I. Believed to have been born in 1208, Smbat became commander-in-chief of the Cilician army (Constable or sparapet) in 1226 when barely 18 years old, and he occupied that office for some 50 years¹. In 1246-47 Smbat was sent to Güyük-Khān in Qara-Qorum to negotiate a peace agreement between Cilicia and the Mongols. This journey lasted two years². Smbat died in 1275/76 at the age of 67, several days after being thrown from his horse in a triumphant battle against Egyptian invaders³. The Chronicle Smbat compiled covers the period 951-1272. Information on the 13th century derives from official documents which the author had access to and from his acquaintance with the principals. The Chronicle is important for confirming details of political and military history, though it contains little detail on the lords of Greater Armenia⁴.

¹ Smbatay sparapeti taregirk' [The Chronicle of Smbat Sparapet], S. Agelean, ed. (Venice, 1956), Introduction p. v.

²

Smbat's journey is recorded by numerous sources. See A.G. Galstyan's Armenian article, "The First Armeno-Mongol Negotiations", PBH #1 (1964) and its English translation in the Armenian Review #29 (1976), especially pp. 33-34.

³

M. Abelyan, Works, vol. 4 p. 248.

⁴

All editions of the Armenian text ("Smbat's Chronicle"), and all translations of it prior to the Armenian edition of Venice, 1956 were based on 19th century copies of two late manuscripts then housed at Ejmiacin [The Armenian text of Smbat's Chronicle was published twice: by Oskan of Erevan (Moscow, 1856) and by Sahnazarean (Paris, 1859). A partial French translation, Chronique de Sempad, was made by V. Langlois (St. Petersburg, 1862). Dulaurier published much

In addition to the more lengthy chronographical works just mentioned, a number of shorter chronicles dating from the 13-15th centuries are important for the details they provide about events merely alluded to elsewhere, particularly for western Armenia for which at times they are the only sources. They are: the Anonymous Chronicle of the XIIIth Century, the Annals of Bishop Step'annos (13th century) the Annals of Het'um II (13th century), the Chronology Attributed to Sargis Picak (14th century), the Chronicle of Kirakos Rštuni (15th century) and the Anonymous Chronicle of Sebastia¹.

of the text and a French translation, beginning with the year 1092 in the Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Documents arméniens, I, pp. 610-72]. The recent Venice edition is based on a manuscript of the late 13th or early 14th century which had been cited in the works of L. Ališan as the "Royal Chronicle" [Sirarpie Der Nersessian, "The Royal Chronicle of Smbat Constable", Dumbarton Oaks Papers #10 (1959) pp. 143-44]. S. Der Nersessian in an article on the Royal Chronicle noted that the Eǰmiacin manuscripts used in earlier publications appear to be an abbreviation of the longer more detailed Venice manuscript (*ibid.* pp. 144--45). This latter manuscript however is defective in its beginning and end and has several lacunae. The editor of the Venice edition, S. Agelean recopied in smaller print those sections which were present in Smbat's Chronicle, thereby producing a continuous text. Regrettably, from the standpoint of this study, that part of the Chronicle which detailed Smbat's mission to the Mōngol court is not contained in either the Eǰmiacin or the Venice manuscripts. It is, however, possible that Smbat's travel notes were utilized by Het'um, Smbat's nephew in Het'um's own history [see A. Galstyan, "Het'umi patmut'iwn T'at'arac' grk'i bnut' agrman harc i sur"] (On the Question of the Characterization of Het'um's Book 'The History of the Tatars'), Telekagir #9 (1958) pp. 70-72].

1

Critical texts for all the above-mentioned chronicles were published with extensive erudite notes by V.A. Hakobyan Minor Chronicles of the XIII-XVIII Centuries, 2 vols. (Erevan, 1951 and 1956).

Finally, accounts of a number of neo-martyrdoms which had occurred during the 13-14th centuries are relevant for their descriptions of the religio-juridical position of the Christian Armenian lords in a time of an ascendant Islam, again, especially for western and southern Armenia about which the more lengthy literary histories are often silent. In 1903 H. Manandyan and Hf. Aĉarean published the critical edition of a collection of records of martyrdoms occurring between 1155 and 1843. These episodes are drawn primarily from various menologies and collections of sermons and from the works of medieval historians. Accounts of the following 13-14th century neo-martyrs were used in this study: T'eodoros of Caesarea (d. 1204), Grigor Xalbakian of Xaĉen (d. 1223), Hasan Jalal of Xaĉen (d. 1261), Grigor of Balu (d. 1290/91), bishop Grigor of Karin/Erzerum (d. 1321/22), Amēnawag of Derĵan (d. 1335/36), bishop Vanak of Bĵni (d. 1387/88), archbishop Step'annos of Sebastia (d. 1387/88), Awag of Salmast (d. 1390/91), Elisabet' of Xafabast (d. 1391/92) kat'olikos Zak'aria of Alt'amar (d. 1393/94) and T'amar of Makk' (d. 1398/99)¹.

¹ H. Manandian and Hf. Aĉarean, Hayoc' nor vkanere, 1155-1843 [Armenian Neo-martyrs], (Valarsapat, 1903).

Colophons of the 13-14th Centuries

The colophons of Armenian manuscripts represent an important source for the history of Armenians and neighboring peoples from the 10th century on. For the 13th century, the colophons are valuable for the information they provide supplementing what is known from other historical sources. For the 14th century--a period which failed to produce historians such as Kirakos, Vardan, and Step'annos--the colophons become the major source of our information.

Colophons are those writings usually found at the end of a manuscript and most often made by the manuscript's copyist or recipient. Frequently providing the copyist's name, the year the manuscript was copied, and the year the colophon was made, these often lengthy addenda sometimes provide considerably detailed information not found in other sources concerning political and military developments, taxation, agriculture, the condition of villages, towns, cities, and monasteries and churches, and the place where and circumstances under which the manuscript was copied. Written as they usually were by professional scribes from humble backgrounds, possessing limited educations, the colophons are also important from a linguistic standpoint, since they contain numerous

dialectal forms and much foreign terminology¹. The humble origins of the copyists also led them to relate mundane details--so valuable for the historian-- often ignored by churchmen such as Kirakos, Vardan and Step'annos.

The great importance of colophons was appreciated already in the 13th century by Step'annos Orbelean who made use of them in his History. The 17th century author Arak'el Davrižec'i, the 18th century Mxit'arist M.Çamçean, and the 19th century Lewond Ališan made prodigious use of colophons in their works. In the 20th century a number of studies on feudal families by Garegin Yovsēp'ean were based almost exclusively on colophons. In no case, however, did any of the above authors have the full corpus of colophons at his disposal. During the 19th and 20th centuries numerous additional collections of colophons have been published².

1

For a discussion of, and bibliography on, colophons in English, see A.K. Sanjian, Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts 1301-1480 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), "Preface" pp. vii-xv, and "Introduction" pp. 1-41, passim. See note 2 below on Sanjian's work; also H.S. Anasyan, Haykakan Matenagitut'yun [Armenian Bibliography] vol. I (Erevan, 1959) lxxvii-xcii.

2

The first large collection of colophons (covering the period c. 887-1596) was made by the 19th century scholar Lewond P'irlalemean. The original draft of this collection, of which only a small part has been published, is housed at the Matenadaran in Erevan [Matenadaran Archives #4515, 6273, 6332. Lewond P'irlalemean, Notark' hayoc' (Const., 1888) includes only the period 1393-1467]. Bishop Garegin

Inscriptions

The late 13th century archbishop of Siwnik',
Step'annos Orbelean, perhaps the first to utilize

Sruanjteanc' also collected and published colophons from more than 350 manuscripts [Garegin Sruanjteanc' T'oros Albar: Hayastani Cambord (Brother T'oros, Traveller of Armenia) 2 vols. (Const., 1879-85); Sanjian, p. 5]. The collections of P'irialemean and Sruanjteanc' assume even greater significance when it is recalled that many of the manuscripts from which these colophons were collected in western Armenia were destroyed during and after World War I. The next major compilation of colophons was published by Yakobos Tašean in the 1890's and embraced manuscripts found at the Imperial Library and the Mxit'arist library in Vienna [Yakobos Tašean, C'uc'ak hayeren jefagrac' kayserakan matenadaranin i Vienna (Catalogue of Armenian Mss. at the Imperial Library of Vienna) (Vienna, 1891); C'uc'ak hayeren jefagrac' matenadaranin Mxit'areanc' i Vienna (Catalogue of Armenian Mss. at the Mxit'arist Library in Vienna) (Vienna, 1895)]. Beginning with the 1950's, a number of collections of colophons have been issued. Among these are Garegin Yovsep'ean's Yisatakarak jefagrac' (Manuscript Colophons) presenting 472 colophons dating from the 5th century to the year 1250 [Garegin Yovsep'ean, Yisatakarak' jefagrac' (Antilias, Lebanon, 1951)]. In 1950 the first of several volumes of colophons was published by the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, compiled and edited by L.S.Xaçikyan [XIV dari hayeren jefagreri hiatakaraner (Colophons of XIVth Century Armenian Manuscripts), L.S.Xaçikyan, ed. (Erevan, 1950). Subsequently Xaçikyan, the Matenadaran's learned director, issued a 3 volume corpus of XVth century colophons: XV dari hayeren jefagreri hiatakaraner (Colophons of XVth Century Armenian Manuscripts) part I (1401-1450) (Erevan, 1955); part II (1451-1480) (Erevan, 1958); part III (1481-1500) (Erevan, 1967). Sanjian's work cited above is a selection and English translation of a small number of colophons from this vast collection, excluding the colophons found in Xaçikyan's part III.]. This volume, Colophons of XIVth Century Armenian Manuscripts contains 845 colophons (1300-1400) of which 513 are housed at the Matenadaran while 255 derive from manuscripts found in the Janašia State Museum of the Georgian SSR and the Gorgev Museum[See N.Akinean's review of Xaçikyan, in HA (1951) pp. 467-73(in Arm.) especially p. 468.]. As father Nerses Akinean observed in his review of Xaçikyan's work, while the editor additionally had at his disposal the collections of P'irialemean, Ter-Awetisean(New Julfa),

colophons in his study, was also it seems the first Armenian historian to understand the great importance of epigraphical material and to make lavish use of it. However, the modern scholarly collection and publication of Armenian inscriptions began only in the 19th century. Prior to the publication of K.Kostaneanc's Vimakan Taregir[Annal of Inscriptions]¹, no large corpus embracing inscriptions from both eastern and western Armenia existed. Rather, numerous smaller collections devoted to the inscriptions of one district, one city, to a single monastery or to monastic complexes had been the rule. Frequently collected by travellers, ethnographers and historians, the impressive volume of this work carried out in the 19th century has acquired an added significance in the 20th century when large areas of western and southern historical Armenia are no longer under Armenian political control and regrettably are closed to Armenists. The natural and deliberate destruction of Armenian historical sites in

Lalayan (Vasputakan) and Nersoyan (Oxford and Manchester libraries), he did not utilize available publications of the colophons from Berlin, Rome, Nor Bayazit, Tehran and elsewhere [Akinean, op.cit., pp. 468-69]. Since the publication of Xaçikyan, numerous other catalogues of manuscripts, providing their colophons in full or part have appeared: from the Armenian library of Galata (Antilias, 1959), the Library of the Monastery of Armash (Venice, 1962), the Mxit'arist Library of Vienna (Vienna, 1963), the Library of the Monastery of Bzommar (Vienna, 1964), the Grand Catalogue of Manuscripts of St. James Jerusalem (Jerusalem from 1966 on), the Manuscripts of Arakelotz-Tarkmanchatz Convent of Mush (Jerusalem, 1967).

¹ K.Kostaneanc' Vimakan Taregir: C'uc'ak Žolovacoy arjnagrut'eanc' hayoc' Annal of Inscriptions: Collection of Armenian Inscriptions (St. Petersburg, 1913).

eastern Asia Minor further enhances the value of many of the inscriptions collected from those areas. Kostaneanc's work conveniently incorporated many of the inscriptions previously published in books now rare, or in journals difficult of access¹.

Since 1960, the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia has issued 5 volumes in an ambitious projected series of 10 volumes of Armenian inscriptions, the Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum, a compilation which fully meets the demands of modern scholarship. Volume I (Erevan, 1966) contains inscriptions from Ani, while the succeeding volumes II, III, IV, and VI (Erevan, 1960, 1966, 1973, 1977) embrace those inscriptions located on the territory of present-day Armenia². For western and southern historical Armenia, however, we still must depend on Kostaneanc's collection³.

¹ See the bibliography in Kostaneanc', pp. xxviii-xxxI.

² Divan Hay Vimagrut'yan [Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum] vol. I, H.A. Orbelli, ed. (Erevan, 1966); vol. II, S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1960); vols. III, IV (Erevan, 1967, 1973) under the same editor; vol. VI, S.A. Avagyan and H. M. Janp'oladyan, ed. (Erevan, 1977).

³ The plentiful Armenian epigraphical material from the 13-14th centuries used in our study was originally found on the interior and exterior walls of the many religious and secular buildings constructed in that period, on mausolea, and on the numerous decorated stone memorials known as xat'k'ars ("stone crosses"). Contents vary

greatly. Some inscriptions, such as those on certain xaçk'ars serving as tombstones, are but a few lines. Others on building walls may consist of several lengthy paragraphs. The latter frequently record the name of the donor of the building and geneological information about his or her family, the date the construction commenced and terminated, gifts (including land and money grants) made by the donor, information about political and military events which involved the donor and family members and/or impeded construction, names of the donor's patrons and of prominent secular lords (including Mongol Khans), names of the reigning kat'olikoi and local bishops. In addition, the inscriptions frequently provide the names of taxes and rates paid in a given locality and therefore also are of the utmost importance for the study of Armenia's economic life.

The great significance of this epigraphic material has been appreciated by modern scholars many of whom have made ample use of it in their historical works devoted to the 13-14th centuries. Indeed some monographs on individual feudal families of this period are based almost entirely on inscriptions [For example, G. Ovsepian (Yovsep'ean), Potomstvo Tarsaicha Orbeliana i Mina-Khatuny (The Posterity of Tarsayič Orbelean and Mina-Khatun) Khristianskii Vostok, t. II (St. Petersburg, 1913); I.A.Orbeli, h'Asan Dzhahal kniaz' Khachenskii (Hasan Jalal Prince of Xaçen) Izvestiia imp. AN (St. Petersburg, 1909); More recently, K. Lafadaryan, "Historiographical Observations on the Kyurikyan Princedom of Nor-Berd" Telekagir #4-5 (1940), pp. 167-80 (in Arm.); H.Kurdian, "The Dse Branch of the Mamikoneans", Bazmavep (1956), pp. 155-62, 246-51 (in Arm.)]. Finally, in modern times a number of scholarly studies devoted to the elucidation of certain terms in one particular inscription or group of inscriptions, have produced important results [For example, T'. Avdalbegyan, "A Secret in the Armenian Inscriptions and Its Significance for the Economic History of Armenia in the 13-14th Centuries", Telekagir #2(1927) pp. 43-76 (in Arm.); S. Barxudaryan, "A Few Observations on the Inscriptions of Erevan's Cathedral Church", Telekagir #5(1947) pp. 69-78 (in Arm.); H.G.Zamkoçyan, "On Two 13th Century Inscriptions from the City of Ani", Scientific Works of the University of Erevan, 47(1955) pp. 89-117 (in Arm.)].

Of the various sources considered thus far, while the Armenian sources remain foremost for the study both of the invasions and of the lords, the Anonymous Chronicle in the Georgian History of K'art'li holds a uniquely important place for the study of the lords. During the 13-14th centuries (and to some extent before it) large parts of Armenian territory were under the political control of the Georgian Crown. These areas included the districts of Tašir, Gugark', Lofi, Ani and its environs, Kars and Karin/Erzerum and their environs, and parts of central historical Armenia. Numerous other areas such as Gag, Somxet'i ("Armenia"), Javaxet'i, Tayk'/Tao, Klarjet'i, etc. for centuries were inhabited by mixed Armeno-Georgian populations¹. Consequently the Chronicle speaks about developments in these parts of the kingdom. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of the most important officials at the Georgian court and in the realm in this period were Armenian: the royal family of the Bagratids were of Armenian origin as were the Zak'arids, Arcrunids and Orbēleans, to mention only a few². Just as the Armenian historians present these families in their Armenian milieu, so the Anonymous Chronicle provides a rare opportunity to observe the Georgian side of the personalities of these

¹ See below ch. 2 p. n.l.

² See Appendix A.

many individuals who were bilingual as well as bicultural.

The Anonymous Chronicle, one part of the larger History of K'art'li is devoted to the 13-14th centuries, i.e., to the period 1207-1318 . Unfortunately little is known about the author. He is believed to have been a senior contemporary of king Giorgi the Brilliant (1318-46)¹. The Anonymous Chronicle itself is a remarkable work written by a surprisingly unbiased individual who recorded the positive and negative aspects of Georgia's native and foreign rulers in a clear, concise fashion, avoiding repetitions and keeping to a minimum those tales of the fantastic and miraculous which characterize medieval histories generally. However, like other sections of the History of K'art'li, the Anonymous Chronicle unfortunately lacks absolute chronology, a circumstance which requires the use of other sources for verification. Apparently the author knew several languages and had at his disposal a number of sources now lost².

¹ Vrac' Zamanakagrut'yun (1207-1318) [The Georgian Chronicle], trans. into Armenian with an introduction and notes by P. Muradyan (Erevan, 1971) pp. 11-16. The so-called Old Section of the History of K'art'li is a compilation of 10 historical works written at different times. Of these, 9 present the history of Georgia from remote antiquity to the 13th century, while only one portion, the Anonymous Chronicle pertains to the 13-14th centuries.

²

The author seems to have had some knowledge of Mongolian, since in several passages he transcribes Mongolian names and entire sentences and then translates them into Georgian [K'art'lis C'xovreba (The History of K'art'li) vol. II S. Qauxč'išvili, ed. (Tbilisi, 1959) pp. 177, 268]. P. Muradyan has demonstrated that the author made use--albeit not full use-- of the Persian histories of Juvaini and Rashid al-Din

It was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that there is more than one way to categorize the 13-14th century sources. The method followed here has been to classify the material on the basis of its application to studies of the Turco-Mongol invasions and/or the lords of Armenia in the 13-14th centuries. The Persian literary histories are more relevant for study of the invasions. They are important for their Muslim viewpoint and the picture they provide of Armenia as part of the larger Īl-Khānid government. The non-Armenian chronographies and geographies are important for information on the invasions and conditions in western and southern historical Armenia. Travellers' accounts contain information on conditions of life during the Mongol domination, and on certain Armenian lords. The History of K'art'li holds a uniquely important

Muradyan, op.cit., pp. 24-26. Whether or not he utilized Armenian sources is debated. In one passage he refers to an account "written by a certain other chronicler" (KC p. 226) concerning the flight of queen Rusudan's son David from Qara-Qorum to Abxazia--an account he finds unacceptable. Perhaps he is referring to the peculiar account found in Step'annos Orbelean's History (SO pp. 151-53). A connection between the Chronicle and Grigor Aknerc'i's History of the Nation of the Archers is also possible. It is lamentable that no corpus of Georgian inscriptions comparable to the Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum or even to Kostaneanc's Annal of Inscriptions[VT] presently exists. Nonetheless, some few Georgian inscriptions relevant to the socio-religious history of 13-14th century Armenia have been published. Among these are the inscription of the Georgian kat'olikos Epifan made in 1218/19 when the kat'olikos was blessing the churches at Ani [first published by N.Marr, Napis' Epifania Katolikosa Gruzii (The Inscriptions of Epifan, Katolikos of Georgia), (St. Petersburg, 1910); Armenian translation of the text in Ararat (1911) pp. 664-66]; inscrip-

place in juxtaposition with the Armenian sources, since it reflects the Georgian side of political-military events and of the "Armenian" lords of the 13-14th centuries.

Armenian chronographies, hagiographical literature, colophons, and inscriptions provide new information, but also supplement and amplify what is found in the most important sources-- the 13-14th century literary historians. A few general observations on these sources are in order. First, if the literary histories are categorized by geographical provenance, it is clear that they reveal a definite bias in favor of northeastern Armenia. This tendency becomes comprehensible when it is recalled that the three most important 13th century Armenian historians, Kirakos Ganjakec'i (d. 1270/71), Vardan Arewelc'i (d.1270/71) and Step'annos Orbēlean (d. 1303/4) were all born in this region and passed most of their lives there. Step'annos may be excluded from criticism on this point, since he set out to write the history of an eastern Armenian district, Siwnik'. As for Kirakos and Vardan, although they by no means confine their works to the eastern regions solely, naturally it is about their own milieu that the accounts are most detailed and intimate. As regards the early 14th century Cilician sources, their main interest is Cilicia.

tions of the 13-14th century of Pñjahank' (Axt'alal village) [P.M.Muradyan, "Vrac'eren arjanagrut yunner Hayastanum: Pñjahank' (Georgian Inscriptions in Armenia: Pñjahank') Uraber #1 (1973) pp. 39-57]; and a rare quadrilingual inscription in Georgian, Armenian, Persian and Uighur found at Garesja, Georgia and dated 1352 [L.Melik'set'-Bek,

The major Georgian sources, the History of K'art'li (when speaking of specifically Armenian events) and the few published Georgian inscriptions from Armenia tend to focus on northern Armenia. Some information on western and southern Armenia is found in the minor chronicles, colophons, the neo-martyrdoms, inscriptions and in T'ovma Mecop'ec'i's History, however for the political and military history of the Armenian highlands in the 13-14th centuries the non-Armenian sources are crucial. Thus geographical bias in favor of northeastern Armenia, resulting from the nature of the Armenian literary histories is a problem facing the investigator.

Second, it will be noticed that the 13th century Armenian literary historians Kirakos, Vardan, and Step'annos were all educated, polished churchmen. Their interests were in the important events and lords of the day, and rarely extended down to the lower ranks of society. Such groups as the peasants, the artisans, and other non-clerical non-noble city population, although occasionally glimpsed in the colophons, chronicles and neo-martyrdoms,

"On the Rare XIVth Century Quadrilingual Inscription of Aslan's Son, Sargis" Tekekagir #7 (1946) pp. 31-38 (in Arm.).

The Georgian text of the History of K'art'li based on three 18th century manuscripts was published in full originally by M. Brosset in 1849, accompanied by a French translation [Histoire de la Géorgie, depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIX siècle]. The second publication, made by T'apašvili in 1906 similarly was based on only several mss. [K'art'lis C'xovreba, E. T'apašvili, ed. (Tbilisi, 1906)]. Finally the critical edition in two volumes based on 11 mss. was produced by S. Qauxč'išvili [KC, vols. I and II (Tbilisi, 1955, 1959)]. None of the mss. predate the 18th century].

are essentially left out in the narration. Nor, in this case, do the non-Armenian sources come to the rescue. Possibly extensive archaeological excavation will one day partially right this imbalance, although it is doubtful if the details of everyday life of the lower classes will ever be known. The literary sources therefore contain a class bias.

Finally, the quantity and type of the sources is likewise not constant. The quality of the sources also deteriorates over time. Kirakos, Vardan, and Step'annos lived through the Mongol conquest and domination of Armenia. Kirakos, though taken captive by the invaders, and forced to serve as their secretary, had grudging praise for his new overlords. Vardan and Step'annos both were befriended by the Īl-Khāns and died blessing their wisdom and religious tolerance. But as the Khāns Islamized in the early 14th century, the situation changed dramatically. The unsettled, intolerant 14th century produced no major Armenian historian. Only the humble authors of chronicles and colophons, many of them anonymous, detail the persecutions, plunderings of churches and famines. Finally, with T'ovma Mecop'ec'i's life and History the results of the breakdown of a corrupt and fanatically intolerant Mongol state are observable, for T'ovma was a poorly educated, superstitious cleric who wrote his sorry and disorganized account while literally fleeing from his Muslim persecutors.

CHAPTER TWO

ARMENIA AND THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS

In the early 1220's when Mongol troops first passed through the Caucasus, the Armenian population, living there and in many other localities across Asia Minor, dwelled under considerably diverse circumstances. The many states in which the Armenians were settled in the late 12th and early 13th centuries had arisen as the result of the Saljuq Turkish invasions of the mid 11th century, and for our purposes may be viewed as differing from each other principally on the basis of the amount of political and cultural autonomy enjoyed by their Armenian inhabitants. The nature of the Saljuq invasions/migrations and certain aspects of the consequences of Turkish domination merit a brief examination prior to reviewing the Turco-Mongol invasions/migrations of the 13-14th centuries because, in a certain sense, the invasions of the 11th century were a "dress rehearsal" for several subsequent invasions of Armenia from the Orient. A characterization of the Saljuq invasions and domination will provide not only an introduction to the complexities of medieval Armenian society, but also will throw into sharper relief fundamental similarities and dissimilarities with the Khwarazmian, Mongol, and Timurid invasions and administrations. This chapter first examines briefly some of the more salient features of political

history associated with the pre-Mongol period: (1) the Saljuq invasions of the Armenians highlands; (2) the Turkish domination and its consequences; and (3) the new situation created by the resurgence of Georgia; the second part of the chapter details the invasions of the 13-14th centuries.

The Turkish invasions and eventual political domination of most parts of the Armenian highlands did not occur at any one date, nor were they accomplished by any one group. Rather, both as the contemporaries noted, and as modern scholars have pointed out, from the early 11th century onward various parts of Asia Minor were subjected to direct attack and to infiltration which accompanied the invasions and settlement of diverse Turkic groups there. Turkish migrations to Asia Minor continued from the 11th through the 15th centuries, a period of approximately 400 years¹.

1

Standard reference works on the Saljuq invasions include Claude Cahen's Pre-Ottoman Turkey (London, 1968) [Hereafter PT] plus numerous articles by the same author (bibliography PT pp. 441-50); The Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 5 (The Saljuq and Mongol Periods) J.A. Boyle, ed. (Cambridge, 1968) [SNP]. Speros Vryonis' The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century (Los Angeles, 1971) [D.H.] details the impact of the Oriental invasions on the Greek population of Asia Minor. On Armenia in particular see vol. III of the History of the Armenian People [Hay žolovrdi patmut'yun] (Erevan, 1976) [HAP] chapter 26 pp. 440-60 by S.V. Bofnazyan, "Havastani nvačume seljuk-t'urk eri kołmic [The Conquest of Armenia by the Saljuq Turks]".

The earliest references to Turkish attacks date from ca. 1016 at which time the district of Vaspurakan in southeastern Armenia was raided--not by Turkish armies--but by Turkic mercenaries serving the Muslim emirs of Āzarbāijān. Around 1021 the area from Naxiĵewan to Dwin was raided by Turkmen Oghuz(Ghuzz) nomads serving in the Persian Dailamite armies¹. From 1029 onward,

1

See K.N.Yuzbašyan, "Deilemyt v povestvovanii Aristakēsa Lastiverttsi[The Dailamites in Aristakes Lastivertc'i's Narration]", Palestinskii Sbornik [PS] #7(70) 1962 pp. 146--51; S.G. Agadzanov and K.N.Yuzbašyan, "K istorii tiurskikh nabegov na Armeniiu v XIV [Toward the History of the Turkish Raids on Armenia in the 11th Century]", PS #12 (1965) pp. 144-57. The administrative inclusion into one territorial unit of parts of Caucasian and central Armenia with the Caucasian areas of Iberia, Atrpatakan and Albania dates from the 6th century A.D. when this unit constituted one of four military-administrative districts in the Sasanian Persian empire. After the Arab conquest of Iran and Armenia, Caucasian Armenia and formerly Byzantine Armenia to its west remained in approximately the same association styled by the Arabs "Armeniya" despite the fact that neither Iberia to the north ("Armeniya II") nor Albania to the east ("Armeniya I") was ethnically Armenian. Thus "Armenia" was but a part of what Arabic authors styled "Armeniya". The two terms should not be confused. During the more than 200 years of Arab domination (ca. 650-886), Atrpatakan to the east frequently was united with Armeniya, and its occasionally dependable Muslim lords sometimes were given limited control over parts of Caucasian Armenia. As Aram Ter-Ľewondyan of Erevan has noted, the attempts of Atrpatakan's Muslim emirs to subjugate Armenia found reflection in the works of 10th century Arab geographers --such as al-Iṣṭakhri, Ibn Ḥawqal, and al-Muĵadasi--who regarded Armenia, Arran and Atrpatakan as one province (see A. Ter-Ľewondyan, "K'ust-i Kapkoh varĵakan miavori veraprunknere Xalifayut'yan zamanak [Survivals of the Administrative Unit of Kust-i Kapkoh in the Time of the Caliphate]", TeĽekazir #9(1958) pp. 73-77). The role played by Atrpatakan/Azarbaijan bordering Caucasian Armenia on the east in the pre-Mongol period is of interest since the region's already great importance was in time enhanced further. Atrpatakan/Azarbaijan which had Islamized early, became a base of sorts for the Caliphate for controlling

various Turkmen groups commenced raiding diverse parts of Armenia, from the direction of Āzarbāijān to the east as well as from northern Mesopotamia¹. In 1042 some

Caucasian Armenia, Albania, and Iberia. Subsequently, be it from the Kurdish Muslim Shaddadids who established control over the Albanian city of Ganjak/Ganja in the mid-10th century or from another branch of the same family which gained control of the city of Dwin in the mid-11th century, Armenia was under constant Muslim pressure from the east. Even before the emergence of the Saljuq Turks as a force in the area, exactly what was "Armenian" and what was "Azarbaijani" territory was not always clear. Armenia's eastern border was in a constant state of flux. The expansion or contraction of lands held there by Armenian or Azarbaijani Muslim lords was conditioned primarily by the ambition and martial prowess of a given lord or lords.

1

R. Husseinov[Huseynov], "La conquete de l'Azerbaïdjan par les Seldjucides", Bedi Karthlisa[BK] 48-49 vol. XiX-XX (1965) pp. 99-108; HAP, pp. 442-43. During the more than 200 years of Arab domination, the geographical and demographic conception of Armenia was subject to alteration in historical southern Armenia also. South-western Armenia especially became an area of heavy settlement by Arab tribes. Coterminously the Armenian element in the southwestern districts (the old Armenian districts of Aĵnik' and Hanjit especially) thinned. Indeed, during this period the Armenian place names themselves were replaced by Arabic ones there. Unlike the previous conquerors of Armenian lands, the Arabs left colonies and emirates behind them, which, as Dr. Ter-Lewondyan stated, "opened the first serious crack in Greater Armenia... The Arab emirates drove in the wedge which gradually widened to provide room not only for the Kurds, but also for the Saljuqs, the presence of whose emirates in Greater Armenia became one of the main causes for the Armenian state's failure to survive in the 12th and 13th centuries" (Aram Ter-Ghewondyan, The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia, N. Garsoïan, trans. (Lisbon, 1976) p. 150). Prior to the appearance of the Saljuq Turks in the 11th century, a number of emirates had existed in southern and southwestern Armenia. Among them were the Kaysite emirate, including the cities of Manazkert, Klat' and Knus; and the emirate of Aĵnik' or Arzn, embracing the cities of Mayyafariqin, Arzn and Bales'/Bitis. Southern Armenia then; fairly early had become an area of foreign settlement. This tendency was to accelerate with time.

15,000 Turkmens from the Urmiah area attacked and looted Vaspurakan and defeated Byzantine forces near the city of Arčēš on the northeastern shore of Lake Van, while yet another group was raiding around Bjni in the northern district of Ayrarat (1042/43). From 1045-63, detachments of Turks more or less controlled by Saljuqid sultans and their generals penetrated deeper into Armenia, destroying numerous cities and devastating entire districts: Ani (attacked, 1045), Vałaršawan in the western district of Basen (1047), the Mananaki district of western Armenia (1048), Arcn in the northwest (1048/49), Bayburt (1054), Melitene in the southwest, Colonea in the northwest (1057), Sebastia/Sivās (sacked, 1059), Ani (captured, 1064), Kars (1065?), Caesarea (1067) and Manazkert (1071), to mention only the better known sites¹. While it appears that most of histor-

1

HAP pp. 444-60, passim; M. Canard, "La campagne arménienne du sultan Saljuquide Alp Arslan et la prise d'Ani en 1064" Revue des Études Arméniennes [REA]n.s. (1965) pp. 239-59; C. Cahen, "Une campagne du seldjukide Alp-Arslan en Géorgie", BK 41-42 n.s. XIII-XIV (1962) pp. 17-20; R. Husseinov, "Conséquences de la bataille de Mantzikert (1071) entre Alp-Arslan et Romain IV pour la transcaucasie", BK vol. XXVII (1970) pp. 93-100. Also see Toumanoff's excellent article in Congress, "Background to Mantzikert", pp. 411-26.

ical Armenia had been subjected to sack by 1070, it must be stressed that in several remote mountain areas, small Armenian principalities continued their existence throughout the 11th and 12th centuries, although encircled by inimical forces and under perpetual attack. These areas comprised districts in northern and northeastern Armenia (Gugark', Siwnik', Arc'ax), plus southern and southwestern Armenia (parts of Vaspurakan and Mekk', and Sasun)¹. Consequently, it would be incorrect to speak of "the Turkish conquest" as being fully consummated in the 11th century. Some parts of Armenia never succumbed.

1

Armenian political control over much of the Armenian highlands had been reestablished during the dissolution of a powerful Arab empire beginning in the late 9th century. The Bagratid state, the most powerful of the several Armenian kingdoms which arose in the 9-10th centuries, apparently remembered well not only the legendary glory of Armenia's ancient Arsacid kingdom, but also the more recent extensive unit of Armeniya, which had been named for Armenia, its most important part. Very much as the Muslim emirs of Atrpatakan/Azarbaijan attempted to control parts of eastern Armenia, basing their somewhat dubious claims on their occasional duties as tax collectors in the period of Arab supremacy, or on the more respectable claims of legitimacy through intermarriage with local naxarar houses, so the Bagratids attempted--with considerable success--to gain control of the non-Armenian parts of Arab Armeniya (see Ter-Lewondyan, "Kust..." pp. 76-77). Already by the early 9th century, a branch of the Bagratid family had established itself on the Iberian throne. During the peak of Bagratid power, under king Gagik I (990-1020), that family controlled in addition to Iberia, an extensive state stretching from Basen district in the west, to near Partaw/Barda'a in Caucasian Albania in the east, south to Manazkert and north to Samk'or city. In addition, that kingdom had a number of vassals such as the princedoms of Xaçen, Kogovit', Bagrevand, Gardman and the emirate of Goit'n, while other areas such as the kingdoms of Vanand and Tağir-Joraget, the Kaysite emirate and the principality of Taron were ruled by Bagratid family members and relations

Just as the Turkish conquests of Armenia must be discussed with regard to a particular part of the country at a particular time, so too the groups participating should be distinguished from each other. The eminent Turcologist Claude Cahen has demonstrated that from the very outset, two elements participated in the invasions, conquests and settlement of Asia Minor. Though perhaps ethnically the same people, these two groups are distinguishable on the basis of their subordination (or lack of it) to the Saljuq authorities. One group, which might be called the Saljuq "regular army" consisted of elements more or less obedient to the sultans and their generals. The other group, the Turkmen nomads, appears in the sources as an almost ungovernable force, interested solely in booty.

by marriage. Remaining areas of the Armenian highlands such as Vaspurakan in the south and Siwnik' in the east were also under Armenian rule, although their relations with the Bagratids and with each other frequently were strained and hostile. Consequently, during the 10th century, despite the fact that Armenian political power was reestablished in the heart of the Armenian highlands, and that areas with sizeable and growing non-Armenian population (such as Aljnik'/Diyarbakr) became subject to some type of Armenian suzerainty, it would be incorrect to speak of "the Armenian state" in the 10th century. There were several Armenias at the time.

On the numerous independent and semi-independent Armenian states in the 11-12th centuries see: a. Lofi: L. Movsesian, "Histoire des rois Kiurikian de Lofi", REA, VII (1927) pp. 209-66; b. Siwnik': L. Alisan, Sisakan (Venice, 1893), T'. X. Hakobyan, Syunik'i t'agavorut yuna [The Kingdom of Siwnik'] (Erevan, 1966); c. Arc'ax: M. V. Barxutareanc', Arc'ax (Baku, 1895), B. A. Ulubabyan, Xaçeni išanut' yuna X-XVI darrerum [The Princedom of Xaçen in the X-XVI Centuries] (Erevan, 1975); d. Vaspurakan and Sasun: HAF Ch. 28 pp. 482-87, A. N. Ter-Lewondyan, "Xedeneqyan Arcruninere Vaspurakanum" [The Xedenekean Arcrunids in Vaspurakan] and "Sasuni T'ofnikyannere" [The T'ofnikeans of Sasun"], and V. Petoyan, "Sasuni T'ofnikyan išanut' yuna" [The T'ofnikean Princedom of Sasun"], Telekagir #2 (1955) pp. 85-96.

Indeed, quite often the Turkmens disobeyed commands to resist plundering and, what is important from the standpoint of the establishment of any centralized Turkish state in the pre-Mongol period, Saljuq sultans were frequently obliged to send armies against the Turkmens--fighting Turkmen rebels almost as often, it would seem, as the autochthonous populations¹. Furthermore, the nomadic pastoralist Turkmens were the bane not only of the Saljuq authorities, and, of course, of the sedentary Armenians, but also of the Muslim states which bordered Armenia on the east (the Shaddādids of Ganjak in Caucasian Albania) and south (the Marwānids), in the period of the invasions. Each successive invasion--Saljuq, Khwārazmian, Mongol and Tīmūrid--pushed before it, brought along with it, or dragged in its wake into Asia Minor thousands of these virtually uncontrollable nomadic warriors who (when totally unchecked) devastated the cities searching for plunder, destroyed the countryside and the complex irrigation systems turning cultivated fields into pasturage for their sheep herds, and reduced the possibilities for internal and international trade by infesting the trade routes between cities, and attacking caravans². Despite C. Cahen's

¹ PT p. 27, pp. 32-50.

² DMH pp. 258-85.

differentiation it remains true, nonetheless, that whether a detachment of Turkmens pillaged a given locale under orders from the sultan, or in defiance of those orders, the results ordinarily were the same. Certainly such fine points of distinction were lost on the victims themselves who were killed or raped and led away into slavery. Even if the obviously inflated figures of contemporary eye-witnesses are halved, even if quartered, the extent of the damage occasioned by the Saljuqs during the period of the conquest was and is dizzying¹.

Turning now to some of the consequences of the Saljuq invasions and domination vis-à-vis the Armenians, a number of tendencies are observable. For the most part the Saljuqs acted as catalysts on phenomena which predated their arrival. One striking example of this is the demographic change observable in central Asia Minor (Cappadocia), northern Mesopotamia and Syria. In the early 11th century, the Byzantine government had followed a policy of removing powerful Armenian lords (naxarars) and their dependents from their native Armenian habitats and settling them to

¹ DMH pp. 155-65. Also pp. 166-67, which contain a listing of towns, villages and provinces destroyed, pillaged, enslaved, massacred or besieged.

the west and southwest¹. Thus Cappadocia and Armenia Minor (P'ok'r Hayk'), areas which centuries earlier had hosted sizeable Armenian populations suddenly became re-Armenized on the eve of the Turkish invasions. The invasions quickened the tempo of Armenian emigration and extended its range in a southwesterly direction (into Cilicia) and

1

V.T'emuryan, "Hayeri artagat' e depi gamirk' llrd darum [The Emigration of Armenians to Cappadocia in the 11th Century]", Telekagir #2(1955) pp. 75-83; V.K.Iskanyan, "Arcrunvac artagat' i masin [On the Arcrunid Emigration]" Patma-banasirakan Handes[PEH] #3(1965) pp. 67-82. Without a doubt, prior to the Saljuq invasions of the 11th century, it was Christian Byzantium in the west which posed the greatest threat to the various Armenian kingdoms and princedoms. Indeed, it is clear not only to modern scholars, but the very contemporaries themselves recognized the fact that Byzantium's ill-conceived policies vis-a-vis the Armenian kingdoms were responsible in large measure for the success of foreign conquest and penetration of Asia Minor. Already in the mid-10th century, Byzantium had seized the southwestern Armenian district of Taron. To it were added other western Armenian districts such as Derjan, Mananali, Hašteank' and Palnaturn. Although frequently governed by Bagratdis appointed by Byzantium, the prefecture of Taron including the above-mentioned districts experienced Byzantine administration for over 100 years before the Saljuq conquests. Coterminous with Byzantine military pressure on parts of western and northern Armenia, the Empire attempted to induce various powerful Armenian lords to will their hereditary lands to itself in exchange for new lands elsewhere. Thus did the last king of Vaspurakan, Senek'erim Arcruni leave southern Armenia to settle in Byzantine Sebastia (1021) which was given to him "in perpetuity". Supposedly tens of thousands of Armenians from Vaspurakan accompanied Senek'erim. By a similar route, the Empire acquired the Ani-Sirak kingdom in 1040. The last ruler of that state also received lands in Byzantine Cappadocia, and also quit Greater Armenia with thousands of his followers. The consequences of Byzantine pressure from the west were twofold. First, numerous parts of Greater Armenia were stripped of their natural military defenders, thereby facilitating Saljuq penetration. Second, various areas of Cappadocia, North Syria, Cilicia and Georgia became Armenized or re-Armenized with tens of thousands of emigrants from Greater Armenia. The pace of emigration quickened with the Saljuq invasions. See succeeding two notes. Also R.W.Thomson, "The Influence of

northward (into Georgia)¹. The naxarars, relocating as

their Environment on the Armenians in Exile in the Eleventh Century", Congress, pp. 432-38.

1

The complex history of Cilicia lies beyond the purview of this study. In the absence of any thorough modern study of that kingdom, one might consult G.G. Mikaelian, Istoriia Kilikiiskogo Armianskogo gosudarstva [History of the Cilician Armenian Government] (Erevan, 1952), or S.V. Bohnazyan, Soc'ial-intesakan haraberut yunnere kilikyan haykakan petut yunum [Socio-Economic Relations in the Cilician Armenian State] (Erevan, 1973). On Mongol-Cilician relations see Galstyan's Armenian article in PEH #1 (1964) and the English translation of it in the Armenian Review, vol. XXIX No. 1-113 (1976), "The First Armeno-Mongol Negotiations", pp. 26-37. Political and demographic conditions on the northern border served to confuse what was "Armenian" in that area also. As Cyril Toumanoff has demonstrated [in his Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963), part V: "The Armeno-Georgian Marchlands", pp. 437--99], between Armenia and Iberia from northeast to northwest stretched a series of border districts which were neither Armenian nor Georgian, but Armeno-Georgian, as their double names attest. Possessed of mixed Armenian and Georgian populations, such border districts over the centuries passed from Armenian to Georgian political control (or vice versa). Among these districts were: Tayk'/Tao, Kola'/Koh, Artani/Artahan, Javaxet'/Jawaxk', T'rialet'/T'feik', Ašoc'/Aboc'i, Tašir'/Taširi, Gogarene, Kolbap'or, Jorap'or and Gardman.

A very strong Armenian presence existed in Iberia at least from the Arab period on, when many Armenian families settled there. Among these were offshoots of the Amatunis, Arcrunis, Bagratids, Kamsarakans, and Mamikoneans. C. Toumanoff estimates that about 1/5th of the Georgian royal (Bagratid) and princely dynasties were of Armenian origin [C. Toumanoff, "Caucasia and Byzantium", Traditio 27 (1971) p. 129 n. 73]. The tendency for Armenian emigration northward to Iberia accelerated with time. Concomitantly the creation of great Armeno-Georgian dynasties reflected the growing Armenian influence in Iberia.

In the immediately pre-Saljuq period, the greatest threat to Armenia in the north came not from Iberia, but from the political manoeuvrings of Byzantium. In the year 1000, upon the death of the Georgian Bagratid ruler of Tayk'/Tao, David the Curopalate, David's hereditary state of Upper Tao as well as his Armenian territories--Karin, the districts of Basen and Apahunik' with the city of Manazkert as its capital--passed to the Empire by "will". In 1021 the Byzantine emperor Basil II invaded the north and annexed the

they did with sometimes sizeable forces, occasionally were powers to be reckoned with. Several such powerful and ambitious naxarars carved out for themselves principalities over an extensive area stretching from Cilicia on the Mediterranean, southward to Antioch, eastward to Edessa, northward to Samosata, to Melitene/Malatya, and elsewhere¹. However, it must be stressed that despite what appears to have been large-scale emigration from Greater Armenia, those departing (principally families of means) nonetheless constituted a minority of the total indigenous population of eastern Asia Minor which remained in situ

districts of Tayk'/Tao, Kola/Kol, Artani/Artahan and Javaxet'i/Jawaxk'. Between 1041 and 1043, Byzantium attacked the city of Ani three times, but was repelled each time. In 1045, through treachery, the Ani-Sirak kingdom was annexed. The same year the Pahlawunid principality of Bjni in northeastern Armenia succumbed. Its territories had included the districts of Nig, parts of Varaznunik', Kotayk' plus Kayean and Kaycon fortresses. In addition to Toumanoff's Studies one should consult his important articles in Traditio, especially "Caucasia and Byzantium", and in The Cambridge Medieval History, vol IV, The Byzantine Empire, part I (Cambridge, 1966) ch. XIV "Armenia and Georgia" pp. 619-24 for background. See also Appendix A of this study.

1

HAP ch. 30, "Hay gait' avavrera merjavor Arevelk'um [Armenian Settlements in the Near East]": 1. O.X.T' op uzyan "Milagetk' i ev Asorik' i haykakan gait' avavrera [Armenian Settlements in Mesopotamia and Syria]" pp. 506-15; 2. A.N. Ter-Lewondyan, "Havera Egiptosum [The Armenians in Egypt]", pp. 516-20; M.J. Laurent, Byzance et Antioche sous le curopalate Philarète", REA, IX(1929) pp. 61-72.

and overwhelmingly Armenian in the period covered by this study¹.

1

PT. p. 154. In C. Cahen's opinion, the number of Turkmen invaders/migrants throughout the 11-12th centuries remained small: "Several tens of thousands, certainly; but that they numbered several hundreds of thousands is doubtful..." (PT p. 33). "It is difficult to believe that movements of peoples at that period can have involved more than a few tens of thousands of individuals in any one operation, at the most two or three hundred thousands, even though the texts give the impression of enormous masses (it should be remembered that regular armies in battle contained at the most a few thousand men)" (PT p. 143). See also DMH p. 261 n. 718 where Vryonis has compiled figures from the sources concerning the invasions.

In the 11-12th centuries Turkish settlement in Armenia seems to have been very limited. Cahen notes that Azarbaijan to the east became and remained the ethnic base for the Turks of Asia Minor in this period (PT p. 79). Furthermore, in the early 12th century when Turkish immigration in Iran itself had become stabilized, "the Turks established in Asia Minor no longer permitted any others to come among them and divide their spoils" (PT p. 90). Turkmen "settlements" (or perhaps, "concentrations" would be more apt, since the Turkmen were nomads) were established "when and if [the Turkmen tribe] could secure a winter base after its summer raids. Until it could acquire and defend a winter base in Anatolia, the tribe usually left Asia Minor at the end of the summer raiding season. Once located, the tribes usually established a semianual transhumant pattern between their summer yayla in the mountains and their winter base in the plains" (DMH p. 279). For a list of possible Turkmen settlements--temporary and "permanent"--cited by 11-15th century sources see DMH p. 281 n. 791.

The medieval Armenian translation of the KC, known as "Juanşer", mentions Turkmen concentrations and their yaylas in northern and northwestern Armenia. Speaking of the success of Georgian king David II the Builder (1089-1125) in expelling these elements, the text reads: "In that period some 10,000 Turks raided in Tfełk' ([Trialeti]). David was at Načarnad. When he heard about them he came at night with but few troops, and in the morning, with God's aid, beat them until evening. The few survivors fled at night. Similarly, in the Tayk' country there were tens of thousands of Turkish troops which had descended into the Tayk' country. [David] went and struck them, and took their goods, and the country of Georgia filled up with good things.... But while the great David was celebrating the feast of Easter at Naxedran, they brought him news that

Another tendency of medieval Armenian life receiving a stimulus (or perhaps, reaffirmation) from the Saljuq domination was centrifugation, a key feature of Armenia's socio-geopolitical system, naxararism¹. The Saljuqs were even less successful than their Armenian predecessors (Arsacids, Bagratids) in holding together in one state the different parts of eastern Asia Minor. As was mentioned above, centrifugal tendencies were inherent in the very nature of the Turkish migrations/invasions. Furthermore, the ruling family of the Saljuqs--just as their Armenian predecessors--was obliged to grant appanages to junior

the Turks had slain Bēškēn in Jawaxēt' and had come and encamped on the shores of the Arax. He went against them, destroying and capturing their entire army....He struck at the Turks in [their] wintering grounds of T'ulark' and filled up with booty. On the 13th of February and on the same septenary of fasting, he took Kapa city and filled up Georgia with gold and silver. On May 5th he raided Layižk' as far as K'urdawan and Xstalan and returned to K'art'li in wealth. The same year he went to Ašorni and beat the army of Turks until there were not left [even] mourners in their tents....Now the Turkmens ascended the mountains of Armenia in summertime and in wintertime descended to the warm meadows by the banks of the Kur river--but not without great preparation due to fear of David. However, that year they were without a care because of the king's distance. The king returned, skiring Mt. Lixt before him, and came to K'art'li. He found prepared troops in the month of March and went to Xunan and did not allow [any] of the multitude of Turks to live. He crossed to Partaw and discovered in the villages, fugitives from the Turks. He put them to the sword and returned in peace" (Juanšer, p.118-20).

1

See the introduction and also ch. 3 below.

members and these "fiefdoms" quickly transformed themselves from conditional to hereditary landholds¹. Indeed, prior to the establishment of Saljuq control over much of the Armenian highlands by the late 11th century, the proliferation of small and usually mutually inimical Muslim emirates had begun. In the east, embracing parts of eastern Armenia, Caucasian Albania, and Āzarbāijān was the emirate of Ganjak (ruled independently from 1148 to 1225)². In the south, in the areas of Aĭjnik'/Diyārbakr and Xlat', the holdings of the Muslim Marwānid emirs quickly were confiscated by the Artukids of Aĭjnik' (1101-1231)³, and the Saljuqid Shāh Armens of Xlat' (1100-1207)⁴. In the west, the Turkmen Dānishmandids (1097-1165) ruled a large area including Sebastia/Sīvās, Caesarea, and Melitene/Malatya⁵. Finally, in the northwest, were the emirates of Karin/Erzerum (ruled by the Saltukids ca. 1080-late 12th century) and Kars (ca. 1080-1200). From 1118 Erzinjan and Divrigi belonged

1 PT pp. 234-48.

2 On the emirate of Ganjak to 1075 see V.Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History (London, 1953) pp. 1-77; thereafter, SMP pp. 169-71, 176-83 passim; HAP pp. 475-79.

3 PT pp. 101-2, 126-32; SMP pp. 111-12; HAP pp. 465, 469-70, 486-91 passim.

4 H.G. T'uršyan, "Shāh-i-Armenner[The Shāh-i-Armens]", PBH #4 (1964) pp. 117-33; PT pp. 46, 107, 127; A.N.Ter-Lewondyan "Shāh Armeneri amiravut' yune Xlat'um [The Emirate of the Shah Armens at Xlat']", HAP pp 487-90.

5 PT pp. 96-107; HAP pp. 469-70, 579-80.

to Mangūjek, founder of yet another dynasty¹. The ruling dynasties of these states were sometimes joined together by marriage ties, or sometimes united to fight a common enemy (usually Georgia to the north). But more often they were at war with each other. Meanwhile, throughout the 12th century the Saljuqid Sultanate of Rūm, centered at Iconium/Konya in the west, was constantly attempting to control one or another of the above-mentioned states. As economic conditions stabilized by the end of the 12th century, Konya was indeed well on the way to achieving its aim².

¹ S.V. Bornazyan, "Salduxyannere Karinum [The Saltukids in Karin]", HAP pp. 490-91; PT 106-8, 115, 118; HAP p. 492, PT p. 127; PT pp. 108-12, 236-37, 242-44.

² PT passim, H. Massé, "Le sultan seldjoukide Keykobod Ier et l'Arménie", REA IX(1929) pp. 113-29.

The political, social and economic fragmentation of Armenian states which accompanied the Turkish invasions and a similar fragmentation of Turkish states resulting in the proliferation of emirates was new neither to the Armenian nor to the Turkish polity. Also not unexpectedly for naxarar Armenia, the political fragmentation was accompanied by religious fragmentation. Not only were numerous small Armenian political entities engendered, but several kat'olikoi (or anti-kat'olikoi) emerged in the 11-12th centuries. In this case, too, the confusion created by the Saljuqs acted as a catalyst on a phenomenon of hoary antiquity, which long predated their arrival¹.

The situation created by the overlordship of ostensibly Muslim rulers over Christian Armenians across most of the Armenian highlands was not new². Inasmuch as religious and political agreement in the ancient world were often inseparable, and because Armenia's powerful neighbors were determined to control that state, the Armenians were no strangers to religious persecution³. Immediately prior

1 H.M. Bart'ikyan, "Hayastane Byuzandakan tirapetut'yan nerk'o, 3. Kronakan k'atak akanut yune[Armenia under Byzantine Domination, 3. The Religious Policy]" HAP pp. 435-39; H. Berberian, "Le Patriarcat armenien du sultanat de Roum", REA n.s. #3(1966), pp. 233-43.

2 On the nature of Turkish "Islam" see DMH pp. 270-73; PT p.8.

3 Throughout most of Armenia's history, the pressure to alter the country's apostolic Monophysitism had come from

to the arrival of the Saljuqs the Armenian people had been subjected to a bloody campaign of religious persecution from Orthodox Byzantium¹. For this reason, and because of the violently anti-Byzantine reaction such a policy engendered, all segments of the Armenian population did not respond in a uniform way either to the Saljuq invasions, or to the domination. Indeed, some few Armenians saw the anti-Byzantine Turks not as the agents of God sent to punish Armenians for their sins, but as an excellent vehicle opportunely available to themselves for vengeance against the Greeks. The contemporary non-Armenian sources in particular accuse the Armenians of siding with the Turks, deserting from the Byzantine armies sent to "defend" Armenia, and even joining the enemy².

three directions: (1) in the west, from Orthodox Chalcedonian Byzantium; (2) in the east from Iran and Atrpatakan/Azarbaijan (first Zoroastrian, later Muslim); and (3) in the south from Muslim Syria and the Arab emirates established in southern Armenia. Over the centuries, many Armenians living in areas bordering these three regions, or settled within these states themselves had, for reasons of expediency or conviction "apostasized". See Toumanoff's "Armenia and Georgia", passim.

1 Bart'ikyan, op.cit., DMH pp. 92-93.

2 DMH pp. 93-110.

The establishment of Turkish political overlordship over an overwhelmingly Armenian Monophysite Christian population in eastern Asia Minor, and over Graeco-Armenian populations in central Asia Minor did not immediately lead to widespread conversions to Islam. This was to occur in the 12th and early 13th centuries, and to resume after a hiatus, in the early 14th century. But during the time of the Saljuq invasions, Armenian Islamization seems to have been limited, restricted mostly to those obliged to convert to save their lives, and to the tens of thousands of Armenian women and children forcibly removed from their homes and sold on the Middle Eastern slave marts entering Muslim harems and households¹. In this early period too, several influential Armenian naxarar women were sought after as brides by Saljuq rulers².

1

On Saljuqid slave-trading in Asia Minor see DMH pp. 174--79, and also my article, "The Slave Trade in Armenians in the 11-14th Centuries" in a forthcoming issue of the quarterly Ararat during 1980.

2

The daughter of Kiwrike, king of the semi-autonomous northeastern Armenian state of Tašir-Joraget is one example. With great reluctance her father surrendered her to sultan Alp Arslan (in 1064/65) [Patmut' iwn Matteosi Ufhayec' woy (The History of Matthew of Edessa) (Jerusalem, 1869) pp. 174-75 [Hereafter MEd]. See also Juanser, p. 113; Another example may be Gohar khātun (d. 1118/19), wife of sultan Malik Shah's son, Isma'il (MEd, p. 427). It is clear from the testimony of Abu'l Fida that already by the mid-11th century, Armenian women (most probably Muslim Armenians, or Islamized slave-women) were being taken as brides by the now Turkicizing Caliphs of Baghdad, supreme chiefs of orthodox Muslims: 1. Kat'r an-Nada (d. 1057/58), mother of Caliph al-Kayim (Nalbandyan trans. of Abu'l Fida, Arabakan albyurner, Erevan, 1965) p. 215 and n.20; 2. Arjivan, mother of Caliph Muktadi bi-Amr Allah Abu'l Kasim (d. 1094/95) p. 217 and n.26; 3. the mother of Caliph

Presumably many of them Islamized. Subsequently, after the establishment of Saljuq political control, other Armenians converted, be they the young Armenian boys, gulams, absorbed into the Saljuq military schools, or the skilled Armenian bureaucrats and artisans who dominated numerous important positions within the various Turkish states, and who figure prominently in Turkish epic literature (see below)¹.

The upshot of this conversion, forcible or voluntary, was the creation with time of a distinct group--virtually excluded from the Armenian sources as "renegades", but apparently not yet fully accepted by their new Muslim co-religionists either, who in their sources usually style

Mostadi bi-Amr Allah Abu Muhammad al-Hasan ibn Yusuf ibn Mostakid (d. 1180), p. 222 and n. 50. The fact that succession in the Caliphate tended to pass hereditarily from father to son meant that throughout the 11-12th centuries, many of the Caliphs were of some Armenian descent. However, it must be underlined that Armenian extraction did not necessarily mean that the individual identified with the Armenians, or even that he or she was aware of the relation.

¹ DMH pp. 240 ff. Also on the gulams see Sp. Vryonis, "Seljuk Gulams and Ottoman Devshirmes", Der Islam, XLI (1965) pp. 224-52.

them "Armenians"¹. However, it must be underlined that the majority of the Armenians remained true to their own

1

Most notably Abu'l Fida, who specifically notes the Armenian descent of certain Caliphs as well as of prominent functionaries in Muslim governments. The Armenian literary historians are loathe to mention the reality (and of course the extent) of conversion. However, that intermarriage with Muslims was indeed becoming a problem is clear from certain articles in the so-called Penitential of Dawit' of Ganjak, C.J.F. Dowsett, ed. (Louvain, 1961) Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vol. 216, Scriptores Armeniaci tomus 3. This work, which deals primarily with the degrees of penance necessary for various offenses was written at the beginning of the 12th century in or near Ganjak. Dr. Dowsett writes: "As the many passages in the Kratk' kanonakank' [Penitential] dealing with the relations between Christians and infidels (usually specified as Kurds) show, Dawit' lived his life in a time of troubles for his church and nation. The Christians were subject not only to the contamination of their food, vessels and holy places by Muslims, and the misfortune of seeing Armenian women become their wives, mistresses or nurses: the church might clearly at any time be threatened by what Dawit' calls "hopeless tyrants"(ch. 37), and attacks on Christians were not unknown (chp. 59)". The relevant entries are: (16) Concerning an Armenian woman who lives with a Kurd [and will not separate from him] for the sake of Christianity, p. 16; (17) Concerning a woman who dwells with a Kurd, p. 17; (18) Concerning a woman who fornicates with a Kurd, p.17; (19) Concerning those who voluntarily give their daughters to infidels, p.17; (20) Concerning those who feed the children of infidels at the breasts, p.18. That many of the same problems had continued through the 12th century is clear from the inclusion of identical or similar entries in the Law Book of Mxit'ar Goš (d. 1213).

Religious conversion in this period was not unidirectional. There was also Turkish conversion to Christianity, both forced and voluntary. Juanšer, speaking of the deeds of David II the Builder (1089-1125) notes David's attempt to Christianize the shamanist Qipchaq Turks of the north Caucasus: "Now [David] kept with him on Georgian soil 40,000 Qipchaqs with their families and sons plus 500 young children whom he raised at his court as Christians, and others still day by day were baptized and studied the faith of our Lord. He armed the 40,000 and designated spasalar for them and repelled Persia and T'urk'astan with them". Juanšer, p. 119. Similarly, voluntary conversion of Turks to Monophysitic Christianity was not unknown. The Armenian Church has canonized the Turkish martyr Yordanan who was slain in Karin/Erzerum on Good Friday, 1182,

distinctive form of Christianity. This fact, coupled with the reality of an Armenian majority in eastern Asia Minor, in its turn led to yet another phenomenon--also not new on the highlands, albeit this time affecting the overlords, not their subjects, i.e., what might be termed the Armenization of the Saljuqs¹. Not only did Armenians of different faiths--Apostolic, Orthodox, Muslim--constitute the bulk of the population in eastern Asia Minor during the Saljuq domination, but fairly quickly an Armeno-Turkish community came into existence through intermarriage². Intermarriage occurred not only between the families of Armenian civil servants and Turkish lords, but at the very pinnacle of the state. By the 13th century, few were

1 Armenization which resulted from intermarriage with Armenian noble families and from the naxararization of foreigners occurred in some of the Arab emirates of southern Armenia and among some of the Kurdish Shaddadids in the 10th-12th centuries. See Ter-Lewondyan, Emirates, pp. 45-50, 97-98, 119, 124; Minorsky, Studies, pp. 39, 43, 47 n.1, 51, 80-106 passim.

2 Turks also intermarried with Greeks and Georgians. Greek sources style the offspring of such unions mixovarvaroi. "Though this phenomenon of intermarriage and the appearance of a new generation of mixovarvaroi is only briefly mentioned by the sources, one must assume that it was no rare or isolated occurrence. These mixovarvaroi suffered occasionally from a dichotomy of political sympathy and allegiance, but in the long run their appearance in Anatolia resulted in a process that favored the growth of the Muslim population at the expense of the Christian population, because Muslim society dominated politically and militarily. It is interesting, but unprofitable, to speculate about what would have happened to the Anatolian mixovarvaroi under different political circumstances" (DMH p. 176). Vryonis continues elsewhere: "There is every reason to suppose

the Saljuq sultans and rulers of eastern Asia Minor lacking an Armenian, Georgian or Greek parent or grandparent¹. Indeed, some have suggested that the great warlord and founder of the Danishmandid emirate, hero of the Turkish epic the Danishmend-name, emir Malik Danishmand himself, was an Armenian Muslim². Judging from the many clearly

that intermarriage took place rather extensively from the very beginning of the Turkish occupation of Anatolia and for several centuries thereafter. Anna Comnena speaks of the offspring of such unions as mixonarvaroi, and the twelfth-century Balsamon refers to their curious practises. When the Greek historian Nicephorus Gregoras passed through Bithynia en route to Nicaea in the middle of the fourteenth-century, just one generation after the conquest of Nicaea, he observed that the population consisted of Greeks, mixonarvaroi (Graeco-Turks), and Turks. Thus intermarriage of Muslims and Christians at every level of society played a very important role in the integration and absorption of the Greek Christian element into Muslim society" (DMH pp. 228-29). The Turkish-language equivalent of mixonarvaroi may have been ikdish, signifying a gelding or cross-bred animal, particularly a mule. See PT pp. 192-93.

1

DMH, pp. 227-34. Furthermore, certain Christian families of western and central Asia Minor, cited as "Greeks" in Greek sources, such as the Tornikes, Taronites, Phocades, Musele, Skleroi, etc. were in fact of Armenian descent, even if no longer identifying as such. See A.P.Kazhdan, "Armiano-vizantiiskie zametki", PBH #4(1971) pp. 93-105, and the same author's recent study, Armiene v sostave gospodstvuiushchego klassa Vizantii v XI-XII vv. [Armenians in the Composition of the Ruling Class of Byzantium in the XI-XII Centuries] (Moscow, 197); P. Charanis, The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire (Lisbon, 1963).

2

According to S.Eremyan, "Liparit zoravari hajordnera ev Danismanyan tohmi cagman xndira [The Successors of General Liparit and the Problem of the Origin of the Danishmandid Line]", Telekagir #8(1947) pp. 65-79, Malik Danishmand was none other than the Armeno-Georgian Hrahat/Rat Orbelean/Liparitean. The Turkish scholar Halil Yinanç, Selcuklular Devri, [cited by I. Melikoff in La Geste de Melik Danismend (Paris, 1960) p. 76] probably following the 18th century Armenian historian M. Çamçean has suggested that Danishmand was an Armenian captive of war--possibly

Saljuq architecture not only took some of its inspiration from Armenian ecclesiastical and civil structures which graced and still grace the landscape of eastern Asia Minor, but in the 11-13th centuries, many of the structures themselves were designed and constructed by Christian and Muslim Armenians¹. By the end of the 12th century Armenia was well on the way to absorbing and transforming its newest residents.

The emergence of Georgia as a great military power in the late 11-12th centuries radically shifted the balance scales in favor of complete Caucasian cultural as well as political supremacy in eastern Asia Minor. Thanks to Georgia, much of historical Armenia once again came under Armenian political control--though briefly--and those parts that were not, were either tributary to Georgia or had made peace with that state. Beginning in the reign of the Georgian Bagratid monarch David II, called "the Builder" (1089-1125), the armies of Georgia commenced clearing southern and southeastern Georgia of nomadic Turkmens, capturing from them Šamšoyldē and many strongholds in the Armeno-Georgian district of Somxit'i (1110) ; Lofē

1

DMH p. 236 n. 563. One might also compare the style of dome characteristic of Armenian churches--the gubet'--to the Saljuq kumpets and turbēs. Compare e.g., plates 15,16,17 in S. Der Nersessian's The Armenians (New York, 1970) to PT p. 394 pl. 24, p. 399 pl. 30, p. 402 pl. 34, p. 403 pl. 35.

Saljuq architecture not only took some of its inspiration from Armenian ecclesiastical and civil structures which graced and still grace the landscape of eastern Asia Minor, but in the 11-13th centuries, many of the structures themselves were designed and constructed by Christian and Muslim Armenians¹. By the end of the 12th century Armenia was well on the way to absorbing and transforming its newest residents.

The emergence of Georgia as a great military power in the late 11-12th centuries radically shifted the balance scales in favor of complete Caucasian cultural as well as political supremacy in eastern Asia Minor. Thanks to Georgia, much of historical Armenia once again came under Armenian political control--though briefly--and those parts that were not, were either tributary to Georgia or had made peace with that state. Beginning in the reign of the Georgian Bagratid monarch David II, called "the Builder" (1089-1125), the armies of Georgia commenced clearing southern and southeastern Georgia of nomadic Turkmens, capturing from them Samšoyldē and many strongholds in the Armeno-Georgian district of Somxit'i (1110) ; Loḡē

¹ DMH p. 236 n. 563. One might also compare the style of dome characteristic of Armenian churches--the gmbet'--to the Saljuq kumpets and turbēs. Compare e.g., plates 15,16,17 in S. Der Nersessian's The Armenians (New York, 1970) to PT p. 394 pl. 24, p. 399 pl. 30, p. 402 pl. 34, p. 403 pl. 35.

Agarak and the Kiwriekan holdings (1118)¹; Samaxi, eastern Gugark', western Utik', Gag, K'awazin, Kayean, Kaycon, Tērunakan, Nor Berd, Tawuš, Mahkanaberd, Manasgom, and Xalinčk'ar (1123)². The same year, Ani was taken, though that city passed back and forth between the Georgian and the Muslim emirs many times throughout the 12th century³. During the reign of David's successor Demetre I (1125-1155/56) and his successor Georgi III (1155/56-1184) the conquests continued though at a slower pace. Throughout this period, the Georgian army was swelling with Armenian volunteers, enthusiastically participating in the liberation of their country. Furthermore, the Georgian Bagratids, themselves of Armenian descent, very definitely favored certain Armenian nobles long since established within Iberia and within that country's ruling structure⁴. Such lords as the Zak'arean/Mxargrcelis, Orbēlean/Orbēlis and Arcruni/

¹ Juanšēr pp. 118-19; KG pp. 162-63.

² Juanšēr p. 121; HAP pp. 525-26.

³ T'X. Hakobyan, Hayastani patmakan ašxarhagrut'yun [Armenia's Historical Geography] (Erevan, 1968) pp. 302, 303, 305, 310-11.

⁴ MEd p. 447; Juanšēr p. 122; YT p. 28; W.E.D. Allen, A History of the Georgian People (New York, 1971, repr. of 1932 ed.) pp. 85-108 passim. A certain amount of conflict resulted from confessional differences between Georgians and Armenians, which secular leaders were unable to resolve. See Appendices A and B.

Mankaberdelis not only commanded the victorious armies, but were left in charge of the newly established administrations¹. The Georgian Bagratids reached the apogee of their power under queen Tamar (1184-1213). Under Tamar's generals, the energetic brothers Zak'arē and Iwanē Zak'arean, the Armeno-Georgian armies surged ahead reclaiming one after another fortress, city and district: Anberd in Aragacotn district (1196), Šank'or, Ganjak, Arc'ax, Siwnik', Širak, the Ayrarat plain and Ani (ca. 1199); Bĭjni (1201); and Dwin (1203)². They now turned upon the southern and western emirates, defeating the renowned sultan of Konya, Rukn al-Dīn in the district of Basen (1204)³. In 1204/5 they reached as far south

¹ While, strictly speaking, it is more precise to refer to the lords as naxarar/didebuls [in light of their Armeno-Georgian backgrounds and affiliations] and to provide the double Armenian and Georgian forms of their surnames, since this study examines aspects of the Armenian background only, we shall hereafter prefer the Armenian forms except in cases where the source warrants another usage. HAP, pp. 527-28, 530-31; H.G. Margaryan, "Miĭfeodalakan payk are Georgi. III-i Ŗamanak ev K'urd amirapeta [The Inter-feudal Struggle in the Time of Georgi III, and the Amirapet K'urd]", Iraber #11(1975) pp. 48-60.

² VA p. 138; SO p. 137; Ibn al-Athīr, year 599(1202-3) pp. 507-8; HAP p. 534.

³ AliŖan, Hayapatum, colophon #313, p. 448; A.Abrahanyan, "Ruk n-ed-Dini partut'yune [The Defeat of Rukn al-Din]", Teĭekagir, #5-6 (1941) pp. 78-83; HAP p. 536.

as Manazkert and Arčēš on the northern shore of Lake Van, although this area was not taken until ca. 1208/9¹. Iwanē's daughter T'amt'a was married to the Shāh Armen of Xlat' in 1209/10². In a great final burst, general Zak'arē marched through Naxiǰewan and Jula, through Āzarbāijān to Mārand, Tabrīz and Qazvīn, looting and sacking Muslim settlements³. By the time of Zak'arē's death in 1212, Georgia was the most powerful state in the region, while the status of the Armenians, be they inhabitants of historical Armenia--northeastern, southern, western--of Georgia, or of the plethora of small communities stretching to the southwest to the independent Cilician kingdom had been changed in a very positive way. This situation was to be altered again almost at once.

1

Ibn al-Athīr, year 601 (1204-5) pp. 509-11; year 605 (1208-9) pp. 517-22. In any case, it does not seem that this area was under direct Georgian military control for very long, HAP p. 537.

2

KG p. 164; VA p. 138; Ibn al-Athīr (p. 510) followed by Bar Hebraeus (p. 361) incorrectly reports that "Zakare the Less" died during the siege of Xlat'. Abu'l Fida (Nalb. trans., p. 228) without naming Zak'arē, styles him the "king of Georgia". During the Xlat' campaign, Iwane was captured. The marriage of T'amt'a was part of the peace terms proposed by the Shah Armen. Eventually T'amt'a became ruler of the Shah Armen state in her own right, ruling from ca. 1212-31 (T'uršyān, op.cit., pp. 126-31).

3

KG pp. 184-86; VA chp. 83 pp. 139-40; HAP p. 538; S. Eremyan, Amirspasalar Zak'aria Erkaynabazuk [Amirspasalar Zak'aria Mxargrceli] (Erevan, 1944) pp. 58-60. On the naxarars in this period see chapter three below and also Appendix A.

The great demographic, military, and political changes which had taken place in the history of the Armenians in the late 12-early 13th centuries have left their imprints on the contemporary sources. In the 11-14th century sources there is justifiable confusion over the borders of Armenia. Political boundaries, of course, do not always embrace neatly definable regions of ethnic, linguistic, and cultural entities, and "Armenia" in the 13-14th centuries was a fine example of this. Because of large scale emigration, resulting in the creation of new diasporas, one could draw very wide indeed the cultural boundaries of Armenia, in this period, even though a delineation of the political boundaries is well-nigh impossible¹.

1

As was pointed out above, by the 1220's, Armenians were dwelling over a sizable territory embracing the Armenian highlands, Georgia and Cilicia. Some, though hardly all, of these areas were under Armenian political control, a circumstance which created confusion among the contemporaries. Mxit'ar Gos (d.1213) for whom as for other Armenian clerics the political boundaries were less important than the demographic, used a new term to designate part of Armenian-inhabited southern Armenia, alternately controlled by the Ayyubids and the Shah Armens: "meso-Armenia" (mi'n-ahayk', Arakk', Mxit'aray Gosi (The Fables of Mxit'ar Gos) (Venice, 1854) p. 160). With the Mongol invasions and domination of most of Asia Minor, political boundaries became less distinct. For the 13-14th centuries, characterized by the almost perpetual invasions, we are unable to do more than cite the testimony of confusing and/or confused sources. To the Arab geographer Yaqut (d.1229) the uncertain boundaries of Armenia reflect the confusion occasioned by Georgia's resurgence and expansion into previously Armenian-controlled and/or populated areas, as well as the reality of Armenian majorities in areas not under Caucasian political control. Moreover, in Yaqut's day, the 7th century Arab geographical designation "Armeniyya" still was being used, although the author notes

that its constituent parts were debated: "It is said that there are a Greater and Lesser Armenia. On one side reaching from Barda'a to Bab al-Abwab and on the other as far as the country of Rum and the Caucasus mountains and the country of lord Sarir. Some say that Greater Armeniy a is composed of Akhlat'/Xlat' and its environs; while Lesser Armeniy a of Tiflis and its environs. There are also those who say that there are three, even four Armeniy as. The first consists of Baylakan, Kabalan and Shirvan and the regions subject to them; the second: Jurzan, Suddabil, Bab Firuz-Kuban and al-Lak'z; the third: Basfurjan, Dabil, Siraj, T'ayr, Balravand and Annašavan; in the fourth is the grave of one of the Prophet's comrades, Saifan ibn al-Muatt'al...also Šimsat', Kalikala [Erzerum], Sisakan, Davil, Našava, Siraj, T'ayr, Balravand, Xlat', and BaJunayis, formerly were under the Greeks' domination, but the Rumi's united them to the Širvan principedom"(Yaquṭ, Malb. trans. p. 16-17). Among the cities and districts of Armeniy a Yaquṭ listed as having Armenian Christian populations are: Arčeš(p.12), Erzinjan(p. 14), Erzerum(p.15), Aflughunia (near Nisibis, p. 21), Bayburt (p.28), Balu (p.30), Bitlis(p. 33), Čapaĵur (p.46), Xlat' (p.60), Dwin(p. 62), Zavazan/Anjewac'ik'(p. 76), Samosata (p. 79), As-Suwaida (near Harran, p. 81), Taron (p. 92), Kaizvan (p. 96), Kabala (near Darband, p. 99), Kars (p. 99), Mokk' (p. 110), Muš (p. 111), Manazkert (p. 111). Yet the same author speaks of Azarbaijan as extending "west as far as Erzinjan"(p.10).

To William of Rubruck, Sebastia/Sīvās was located "in Lesser Armenia" (WR p.276) and Erzerum "belongs to the Sultan of Turkie (WR p. 266), but the same author continues: "You must know of the Turks that not one man out of ten among them is a Saracen; nearly all are Armenians and Greeks" (WR p. 280). Speaking about the population of Marsengen (between Kars and Erzerum) he noted: "All the people in the burg were Christians--Armenians, Georgians, and Greeks. The Saracens had only the lordship" (WR p. 273). Interestingly, William describes his host Sahnšah of Ani, not as an Armenian, but as "a Georgian prince" (WR p. 271). The celebrated Venetian Marco Polo travelled across the Armenian highlands in the year 1294/95, and his account pertains to the mid to late 1290's: "Let me begin with Armenia. The truth is that there are actually two Armenias, a Greater and a Lesser [Cilicia]". On the same page, while describing the northeastern borders of Lesser Armenia or Cilicia, Marco Polo wrote: "Lesser Armenia is bounded on the south by the Promised Land...on the north-east and east by eastern Turkey, with the towns of Kaisarieh and Sivas and many others, all subjects to the Tartars" (MP p. 46). Marco Polo mentions the Armenian populations of Konya, Kayseri/Caesarea, and Sivas. He notes the Armenian city of Erzinjan, seat of an archbishop, and the other large cities of Greater Armenia, Erzerum and Arčeš (MP p. 47). In describing the population of the city Tiflis, he mentions the Armenians

before the Georgians (MP p. 50), and observes the presence of Armenians in Tabriz (MP, p. 57).

The late 13th century Geography, attributed to Vardan Arewelc'i, apparently in part under the influence of the 7th century Anania of Sirak, and in part in reflection of the demographic spread of Armenians in the late 13th century, draws the borders of Armenia very wide indeed: including all of historical Armenia plus Edessa and Aleppo (Geog., p.21) Cilicia (p. 24), Azarbaijan (pp. 15-16) and much of Georgia (pp. 17-18). Vardan concludes his Geography with the crucial expression: "these are the lands and districts of Armenia/of the Armenians (aṣṣarḥn ew gawark'n Hayoc')". Indeed, though he does provide the Arabic or Turkish forms of some Armenian place names, he nowhere mentions that in his day most of historical western Armenia no longer was under Armenian political control [see Vardan's usages Arzrum for Karin (p. 18), Tiarpak'ir for Ajjnuk' (p. 21), Malat'ia for Melitene (p. 21), Sewast for Sebastia (p. 23)].

Het'um the Historian, writing in the early 14th century, extends Armenia from the Darial pass in the Caucasus to "Media", and includes (as does Vardan) the city of Tabriz, then an area of Armenian population (Het'um, p. 14). In describing the "Kingdom of the Turks" [Rum], Het'um wrote: "In the Turkish kingdom dwell four peoples: the Greeks, Armenians, Jacobites ...and the Turks" (p. 21).

Ibn Battuta, who visited Asia Minor in the early 1330's wrote of Erzñjan (then almost 300 years under non-Armenian rule): "a large and populous city, most of whose inhabitants are Armenians" (Ibn Battuta, p. 437). To Qazvini in the 1340's, Armenia was divided into two sections. Greater Armenia was the Lake Van basin with its capital at Xlat', though it extended "from Arzan-ar-Rum[Erzerum] to Salmag, and from Arran to the further end of the Akhlat[Xlat'] district" (Qazvini, p. 100). The "chief dependencies" of Lesser Armenia were Sis, Cyprus and Trebizond (!), Qarin and Tarun (p. 100, 258). Schiltberger (who visited the Armenian highlands in 1402-1405) calls Erzñjan the capital of Lesser Armenia (Schiltberger, p. 21) which also embraced Bayburt and Kamax (p. 43). Elsewhere he wrote: "In Armenia are three kingdoms, one is called Tiflis, the other is called Sis, the third is called Ersingen...and that is Lesser Armenia (p. 86). Clavijo noted large concentrations of Armenians in the Tabriz area (Clavijo p. 150, 309). He described Khoy as a city of Upper Armenia with a majority of Armenians (p. 148). He noted populous Armenian villages south of Khoy (p. 330) and stayed in Armenian villages during his transit of central Asia Minor and the Caucasus (pp. 111-148). Contradictions within and among the sources, resulting from the frequent changes in the area's political and military history, preclude a more specific definition of Armenia in the 13-14th centuries.

In the early 1220's, Armenia was subjected to a number of Turco-Mongol invasions. These invasions, all related to one another (though hardly coordinated) were made from different geographical directions. Varying in scope, participants, and intent, all of them nonetheless contributed to the destruction of the military capabilities of the Armeno-Georgian armies. Taken individually, the consequences of each invasion might have been overcome. But the invasions were, in a sense, a chain reaction. One followed the next within the space of a few years. This quick succession of attacks more than anything else explains how the mighty Armeno-Georgian forces, so recently on the aggressive offensive against hostile and far-flung powers, were so quickly humiliated, destroyed or neutralized before the onslaught of the Mongol conquerors in subsequent decades.

Chronologically, the first incursion was made in 1220/21 by a detachment of some 20,000 Mongols who had been sent across Central Asia by Chingiz-Khān in pursuit of the Shāh of Khwārazm¹. The latter succeeded in evading

1

Useful secondary sources on the Mongol invasions are SMP; B. Spuler, The Muslim World, part II, The Mongol Period (Leiden, 1960) [Hereafter, Spuler]; J.J.Saunders, The History of the Mongol Conquests (London, 1971); for Armenia in particular, PT; DMH; Alizade; SEPHA; HAP III, ch . 35, L.H.Babayan, "Mon-čolakan aršavank nere ev Hayastani nvačume [The Mongol Invasions and the Conquest of Armenia]", pp. 597-613; HAP IV (Erevan, 1972) ch . 1, L.S.Xaçikyan, "Hayastani k'alak'akan vičake ev soc'ial-tntesakan haraberut' - yunnere XIV-XV darerum [Armenia's Political Situation

his pursuers and had, in fact, died in obscurity on an island in the Caspian Sea the same time the Mongols were entering the Caucasus¹. The Mongols' route into Armenia was from the southeast, from western Naxiĵewan north to the Aghstev region. A certain disagreement exists among the sources regarding the location(s) of the Mongols' first battle(s) with Caucasian forces. But the outcome apparently was that some 10,000 Armenians and Georgians, commanded by king Georgi IV Laša of Georgia and his atabek Iwanē Zak'arean were defeated in the Kotman area of northeastern Armenia². Through espionage the Mongols

and Socio-Economic Relations in the XIV-XVth Centuries]", pp. 15-47 particularly; also A.G. Galstyan's Russian article in Tataro-Mongoly v Azii i Evrope (Moscow, 1970) and the English translation of it in the Armenian Review vol. XXVII (1975), "The Conquest of Armenia by the Mongol Armies", pp. 356-76 [Hereafter CAMA]. CAMA, p. 357; HAP III p. 600.

¹ SMP. pp. 309-10.

² HAP III p. 600; Babayan is challenged by Galstyan in CAMA, pp. 357-58; The Armenian sources report the following on early Mongol activities in the Caucasus: 1. Kirakos Ganjakec'i: "...Thus finding many people unconcerned, they [Mongols] destroyed and ruined many places. Then they secured their bags and baggage in the marshy, muddy place which lies between the cities of Bartaw and Belukan --a very safe place which they call Belamej--and they destroyed many districts with brazen attacks", KG p. 202; 2. Vardan Arewelc'i: The initial penetration of the Caucasus is presented in chapter 84 of his History. "In 1221... foreign-looking and foreign-sounding people called Muĵal and T'at'ar moved from the land of Ğin and MaĞin and came to Gugark's meadowlands by way of Albania. There were some 20,000 of them. They destroyed everything that they found alive and then quickly turned back. Now [king] Laša pursued them with all his forces, reaching [the Mongols] by the Kotman river. He was defeated by them and saved himself by flight, with Iwanē. Some prince had whipped

the latter's horse (ac̄er z̄iln) such that Iwanē lost him. However, Vahram, lord of the land, who was uninformed of the others' flight, went [pursuing the Mongols] as far as Gardman, displaying great bravery in the face of severe destruction", VA p. 142; 3. Grigor Aknerc'i: Aknerc'i's information on the initial penetration is found in chapter 3 of his History and immediately follows his hazy reference to Jalāl al-Din: "Together with all of this, they once more took a command from their khan, who was called Çankez khan. And they attacked the land of the Albanians and Georgians.

"When the king of the Georgians heard about the coming of the Tat'ars he went against them with 60,000 cavalry to the great plain called Kotman, located before Terunakan fortress. When the battle was joined, through the influence of satan, the enemy of truth, Hamidawla, the lord of Manasa stable, because of some grudge, hamstrung the horse of At'abak Iwvane. For at that time Laša, king of Georgia, had died, leaving a son named Dawit' and a daughter Rusudan (Uruzuk'an). Dawit' had fallen into the hands of the sultan of Rum and was in prison. His sister Rusudan held the kingdom under the supervision of Iwvane, called the At'abak.

"Now as was said above, when the news of the coming of the Tat'ars was learned, Iwvane took the cavalry of the Georgian kingdom and came to Gag, to the great and wise prince Varham, son of Flu Zak'are. Taking him with his own army he went against the Tat'ars. The mighty and great prince Varham took the right wing and Iwvane the left. But when they attacked each other the accursed Hamidawla worked this crime which was described.

"When the Nation of the Archers saw such dissension amongst them, they grew stronger and attacked the Georgian cavalry, mercilessly killing them.

"However the great prince Varham, lord of Gag, who had taken [command] of the [army's] right wing went on until evening, mercilessly attacking and killing the Tat'ars until the plain of Sagam was generally filled with slain Tat'ars. When Varham, prince of Gag heard of the destruction of the forces of the kingdom, sorrowing greatly, he left off warring and returned to his secure fortress called K'arherj. This took place in the year 663 of the Armenian Era (=1215)", GA, pp. 292,294; 4. Step'annos Orbelean: After describing the 7 years of famine and calamities occasioned by Jalāl al-Din, Step'annos wrote: "Now after 11 years, the Lord raised up out of the East the Nation of the Archers or Muhals, also vulgarly known as T'at ars, from the land of Çin and Maçin, from beyond Xat'astan... Now the third division [of the Mongol army] passed straight through the land [of Persia], crossing the great Jahan river which they themselves call the Amu Mawra. And moving about like a storm, they reached our land, generally subjecting every place...The first to come to [this] land were Çawrman, Çalatay, Aslan, Asawur and Laša khan. They took the land in 1237 (685 A.E.)", SO pp. 146-48. In other words, as far as Step'annos cares to relate, the

first penetration of the Mongols was linked with the immediate submission of the Orbeleans; 5. The confused account in the History of Kart'li associates the appearance of the Mongols in Caucasia with the hunt for Jalal al-Din, but the chronology is impossible. Chingiz-Khan sent princes Yamay and Salpian with 12,000 soldiers "having no arms or food, no swords, and only [bows and] arrows.

"They traversed T'uran, Jeon, Xorasan, Eral[Iraq], Atrpatakan, and reached Ganjak. No one opposed them, but if [resisters appeared anywhere, they defeated all of them. Having reached the borders of Georgia they began ravaging the Gag country. Vahram[Varham] Gageli and atabek Ivane learned about this and informed king Laša about foreign tribes speaking an unknown language who had come to ruin Somxit's. The king summoned his army, Imerc's and Amerc's, gathered a force of 90,000 and sent them to that border of Gag where the Tatars were. From there a large force joined them, comprising atabek Ivane and his brother's son Šahnšah [Šanše] and the msaxurt'-uxuc'es Vahram of Gag, and they went on".

The Tatars were encamped on the banks of the Berdu]/Sagin river. They defeated the Georgians who fled. "The Tatars reached as far as Šamšvilde and turned back from there working such amazing deeds. They went by the Darband road [and], because neither the Širvanšah nor the people of Darband resisted them, they passed through the the Gate of Darband and entered the Qipchaqs' country. These they forced to fight, and many times the Qipchaqs battled but the Tatars were always victorious. And so they went on, fighting.

"Thus as I said, [the Mongols], unarmed and with unshod horses, traversing such a road crossed Qipchaq, circumloguted the Darband Sea and reached their ruler Chingiz-Khan in Qara-Qorum. This extraordinary feat was accomplished without stopping, crossing all the roads with unshod horses. Those who had come from Qara-Qorum returned there. When Chingiz-Khan learned that the Tatars had been victorious everywhere, he sent his sons to find sultan Jalal al-Din of Xorasan", KC pp. 166-67; Muradyan[Mur.], pp. 55-56.

learned of an alliance forming against themselves to include besides Armenians and Georgians, those forces still loyal to the rulers of Xlat' and Āzarbāijān. Consequently, without delay the Mongols invaded Georgia in January, 1221 taking along an Āzarbāijāni defector plus his troops of Turkmens and Kurds whom they obliged to fight in the vanguard--a typical Mongol battle tactic¹. Northern Armenia and southeastern Georgia were looted, and then the invaders returned to their base in Utik'. In spring of the same year they moved south toward Tabriz, plundering and destroying the cities of Marāgheh, Hamadān, Naxijewan, Ardabīl, and later Utik's largest city, Baylakan, carrying off large herds of horses, mules, donkeys, oxen and sheep². Despite its success, this army had not been sent for conquest but to pursue the Khwārazm Shāh and to conduct reconnaissance for future operations. Thus, considering their mission accomplished, the Mongols departed via the Caucasus mountains to the north, destroying the city of Šamk'or enroute³. Seen in

¹ HAP III p. 600; Ibn al-Athīr [JA 14(1849)] pp. 447-52.

² HAP III p. 601; Ibn al-Athīr pp. 452-53.

³ CAMA pp. 358-59; HAP III p. 602; Ibn al-Athīr pp. 453-55; According to Kirakos, the king assembled an even larger army and "wanted to battle the enemy. But the T'at'ars collected their wives, children, and all their bags and baggage, and desired to pass to their own land through the Darband Gate. Now the Tačik troops who were in Darband did not allow them to enter. So the T'at'ars crossed the Caucasus mountains at an impassable spot, filling the

retrospect, this Mongol campaign, conducted by a relatively small army of 20,000 was nothing short of astounding, accomplishing the defeat of 20 peoples and a complete circuit of the Caspian in less than two years¹.

The second invasion of the Caucasus took place immediately after the Mongol departure in 1222, and was caused by it. This time the participants were nomadic Qipchaq Turks from the plains to the north. In their turn defeated by the Mongols, one sizeable body of Qipchaqs fled from them in a southward direction. Requesting dwelling places in the Caucasus, they were disbelieved and refused at Darband, whereupon they pillaged and looted there; at the Georgian city of Kabala; and all the way south to the city of Ganjak in Caucasian Albania².

abyss with wood and stones, their goods, horses and military equipment and thus crossed over and went to their own land. The name of their leader was Sabada Bahatur", KG p. 203. Vardan: "In 1223 those same [Mongols] wanted to depart. Furthermore, their ambassadors had found Armenia and Georgia [militarily] ready and assembled, and they so reported (tareal zhambawn). [Thus] they did not dare come and instead turned and went away", VA p. 142.

¹ J.J. Saunders, op.cit., p. 59.

² HAP III p. 602; SEPHA p. 93; Ibn al-Athīr pp. 463-67; Kirakos' information is found in his chapter 12: "Afterwards when some time had passed, another force of Huns, called Xbçaxs came through Georgia to king Laša and to the hazarapet Iwane so that these two might give them a place to dwell and [in exchange] they would serve them loyally. However they did not agree to accept the Qipchaqs.

"So the Qipchaqs arose and went to the residents of the city of Ganjak where they were joyously received, since

The emir of Ganjak permitted the Qipchaqs to settle in the environs of the city, intending to use them against Georgian incursions. The atabek Iwanē mustered troops and went against them, but he was defeated, having underestimated their strength. What was worse, many naxarars and didebuls were captured, then killed or ransomed for huge sums of money¹. The Qipchaqs continued looting and raiding

the people there had been placed in great straits by the Georgian army, which ruined their lands and enslaved man and beast. The Ganjakec'is gave the Huns an area to reside, located within the confines of the city and they aided them with food and drink so that with their help the citizens might resist the Georgian kingdom. The Hun army halted there and settled", KG p. 204. Vardan: "...And in the same year [1223] a large army of Huns called Qipchaqs (Xwçal) came to Ganjak and united with them [i.e., with the people of Ganjak]. And because our forces went against them carelessly and in surety, they were dispersed, separated, and fled. Many were killed by the sword, while others were taken alive and put into prison --some from among the glorious azats included. Among the prisoners were the prince called Grigor son of Xabbak and his nephew (brother's son) the manly and valliant champion named Papak'. They were avenged the next year when our forces wiped out a large part of the Qipchaqs when the latter came to the land of Vardanašat", VA pp. 142-43.

1

Ibn al-Athīr, pp. 468-69; Kirakos: "Then Iwanē mustered troops and arrogantly went against them. He boasted greatly that he would exterminate them and the city as well, placing his trust in the multitude of his soldiers and not in God Who gives the victory to whomever He pleases. When the two groups clashed, the barbarians calmly emerged from their lairs and put to the sword the wearied and [God-]forsaken Georgian army. They arrested many and put the remainder to flight. There was, that day a great destruction of the Christian troops. So many were abandoned by the protection of God that one poor [fighting] man was able to capture many brave and experienced warriors, like a shepherd leading his flock before him. For God had removed His aid from their swords and did not succor them in battle. The Qipchaqs brought the honorable men [of the captives] and sold them for some clothing or food. Persians bought them and tormented them with impossible tortures, demanding such quantities of gold and silver that it was impossible to pay. And many died there in jail.

different parts of the Caucasus until 1223 when Iwanē, in alliance with Āzarbāijānis, Lezghians and other peoples finally defeated the Qīpchaqs, killing or selling them into slavery¹. The Qīpchaq raids, though less serious than the invasions which preceded and succeeded them, nonetheless contributed to the continued unsettled state of affairs initiated by the Mongols; depleted the Armeno--Georgian military of some choice leaders; and undoubtedly weakened the army's morale.

The third devastation of Armenia took place from 1225 to ca. 1230, during which time various parts of the country were subjected to raids and invasions by the ethnically diverse armies of the new Khwārazmshāh, Jalāl al-Dīn Mangūbirdī². Resembling his father, he offered stubborn and occasionally successful resistance to his Mongol pursuers³. This was, however, at the expense

"The Qīpchaqs seized, among others, Grigor, son of Halbak, brother of brave Vasak and his brother's son Papak", for Vasak had three sons...But after some days had elapsed, the great hazarapet Iwane once again mustered troops and went to wreak vengeance on those who had destroyed his soldiers. He attacked them at an unexpected hour and put the barbarians to the sword. He captured their booty and enslaved their children, taking both to his land", KG pp. 204-6.

¹ Ibn al-Athīr p. 470; KG pp. 206-7.

² PT pp. 49, 128; SEPHA pp 94-99; CAMA pp. 359-60.

³ SMP p. 330.

of other peoples, notably the Armenians and Georgians. At the head of an army of some 60,000 Turkmens and Qipchaq mercenaries, Jalāl al-Dīn invaded northeastern Armenia following the age-old route of invasion, through Naxijewan and northward¹. He took and devastated Dwin, and at Gafni defeated the 70,000 man strong Armeno-Georgian army commanded by Iwanē². This was followed by the capture

1

HAP III p. 604; DMH p. 133 notes the general increase of nomadic elements in Asia Minor as a result of Jalāl al-Din's flight.

2

SMP p. 327; Kirakos' account is fairly extensive, and includes one date, 1225/26 (674 A.E.) in the heading for chp. 18 of his History: "18. Concerning Sultan Jalaladin and the Destruction of the Georgian Army in 674 A.E." KG states that Jalaladin, sultan of Xorasan (Khwarazm) as a result of the Mongol attack on his lands fled "through the land of Albania and he came and captured the city of Ganjak. He then assembled his countless troops from among the Persians, Tačiks and Turks and came to Armenia". Iwane learned of Jalal's arrival, informed the ruler of Georgia, and massed the army, boasting that if he defeated Jalal al-Din he would force all the Armenians under Georgia's domination "to convert to the Georgians' religion [to Chalcedonian Orthodoxy], while they would kill those resisting". KG attributes the Caucasian defeat to this blasphemous arrogance.

Meanwhile Jalāl al-Dīn had come to Kotayk'. The Georgian army camped nearby, and observed that the Khwarazmians were unaware of this. "Now as soon as this was observed by one of the senior Georgian princes, Salue and by his brother Iwane, men brave and renowned and triumphant in battle, they said to the other troops: 'You stay in one place while we shall go and engage them. If we turn some of them in our pursuit, the victory is ours. Do you then spring out. But if they defeat us, then do you flee and save your lives'.

"As soon as they engaged them they began to destroy the sultan's army. But the Georgian soldiers paid no attention and instead fled the place..." fleeing unpursued as far as Gafni. Then the sultan's army followed, killing and throwing soldiers over cliffs.

"Sultan Jalal al-Din came to the head of the valley and saw a pitiful sight. For a multitude of men and horses lay there piled up like a heap of rocks. He shook his head and

said: 'This is not the work of man but of God for Whom all is possible'. He then turned to rob the corpses of the fallen, and having ruined many places, went off to the city of Tiflis(Tp xis)", KG pp. 224-25.

Vardan Arevelc'i's information is found in chp. 85 of his History. The account differs in detail from what is found in the other Armenian sources: "Now toward the end of 1225/26, two sons of the Korazm-šah, defeated and harassed by the T'at'ars came in a body of 200,000 so they say, through the land of Āzarbaijan (Adlparakan) to Ostan in Armenia. This they took and filled the plain with wide tents. Our forces went against [the Khwarazmians] and not a few from our side were lost, both by the town of Gafni and, a larger group, which fell over ditches into chasms. This was God's wrath upon Iwane in recompense for the new and alien evils worked by his wife. For when the presbyter Parkešt died, she had his body removed from the grave and burned. Then a dog was sacrificed on the place...". Jalal al-Dīn meanwhile, after conquering many places returned to Tabriz. A year later he went to Tiflis by way of the plains of Gag, VA p. 143.

Step'annos Orbelean's account is briefer than Kirakos' and provides some additional detail. Step'annos notes Jalal's destructive movement from Atrpatakan to the Araratean district where he encamped. When atabek Iwanē went to fight him, the account here becomes somewhat different. According to Step'annos, Šalue and his brother Grigor observed how sparse the Khwarazmian army was and signalled the Caucasian troops to attack. However, God altered the response so that it sounded like "flee". The fleeing army crossed over some loose ground near Gafni which gave way, and the mass fell into the ravine. "But atabek Iwane got away with 10 men and fled into the fortress of Geze.

"As for Liparit [Orbelean], he found some byway and went home with all his men, praising the Lord [for his deliverance]. This transpired in the year 1225/26 (674A.E.). Now after this the whole land became sullied through unbelievable disasters and various [calamitous] events; for the Khwarazmians, finding the land without a master, mercilessly killed and enslaved and set on fire all the homes and dwellings in the cities, villages, and monasteries; they also burned all the crops and cut down the vineyards and trees, as a result of which a severe famine ensued everywhere". A plague followed and wolves, which had grown accustomed to human carrion now began attacking the living. "And this calamity lasted in the land for 7 years", SQ p. 146. Step'annos does not narrate the fate of Jalal al-Din, and seems unaware (or takes it for granted) that the Mongols first came to the Caucasus in pursuit of him.

Het'um the Historian relates nothing about the episode of Jalal. This is interesting since chp. 4 of his History of the Tatars is devoted to a description of Khwarazmia which recounts the country's borders, chief city,

and religion. Grigor Aknerc'i too does not know about Jalal, unless, with Dr. Blake, we take the following passage to be a reference to him: "Now when this strange people [the Mongols] learned that it was the will of God [for them] to rule over us on the earth, they mustered troops and went against the Persians. And they took from them a small city. Then the Persians grew strong and took back their own and some of theirs [the Mongols' land]. Thereafter they sent out a call to wherever the Nation of the Archers--their own people--dwelled. Once more they attacked Persia, conquered them and seized their city and all their goods", GA pp. 290,292.

By far the most extensive account of the exploits of Jalal al-Din is found in the KC. Leaving aside those portions not relevant to the Caucasus, we encounter Jalal and some 140,000 followers near Dwin in Armenia: "[Then] they reached the Mxargrceli country, for Dwin belonged to atabek Iwane, while Ani had been given to his brother's son Sahnšah, the mandat'urt'-uxuc'eg. The Khwarazmians came in the third year of Laša-Georgi's death, to enslave and wreck Dwin and the surrounding countries". Iwane and Vahram of Gag informed Rusudan about the arrival of the foreigners, and an army was sent.

There was some enmity between Iwane and the two Axalc'xec'i brothers, Salva and Iwane. During the first encounter with Jalal, atabek Iwane injured his foot [the author attributes this to the enmity]. This encounter took place near Gafni. Thereafter Iwane refused to participate in further combats. Apparently under his control were parts of the royal army which he also forbade to fight. However, the T'orelis and the two brothers did do battle with Jalal. Salva is captured and the Georgians flee. His brother Iwane died while hiding in the mountains of Gafni. Salva was killed after a year, for not apostasizing. Atabek Iwane returned to Bjni while Jalal went to Azarbāijān and Naxiĵewan whence he raided Georgia. Two years later Iwane died and his son Awag was made amirspasalar.

"[Jalal al-Din] went and destroyed the whole country of Dwin, the k'ust of Dwin, all of Ani, Somxit'i, Gag as far as Ganja, Samk'or. To that time, Samk'or and the neighboring countries belonged to Vahram of Gag..."

Sultan Jalal al-Din learned that the atabek and spasalar Awag was at Bjni and he urged Awag to get queen Rusudan to consent to be his wife. Awag relayed the proposal to Rusudan, who refused it. The jilted sultan headed for Tiflis, destroying Somxit'i enroute (KC pp. 169-73; Mur. pp. 59-63).

of Ganjak, Lofi, and Tiflis in which city a frightful massacre of Christians ensued with the active participation of resident Muslims who looked upon Jalāl as a liberator¹. The northern cities of Ani and Kars, and the southern cities of Xlat' and Manazkert were besieged unsuccessfully in 1226². Certain areas such as Tiflis and Dwin soon were

1
 SMP p. 328; Abu'l Fida (Nalb. trans., p. 230); Kirakos notes that Jalāl al-Din took Tiflis with the complicity of the resident Persians and killed those who refused to convert to Islam. He describes the forced circumcisions and the destruction of crosses and churches. "This occurred not only in Tiflis, but in Ganjak, Naxijewan and elsewhere" (KG p. 226). The gruesome account in Georgian, with many additional details and amplifications is found in KC pp. 175-76; Mur. pp. 64-65.

2
 SMP p. 329; HAP III p. 605; Abu'l Fida (Nalb. p. 231); BH describes Jalāl's seige and capture of Xlat' and Van in 1229 (BH pp. 394-95); see also SA p. 149; Yov. Yiš., #388 pp. 845-46, #392 p. 857, #395 p.862, #400 p.871; CIA v.I p.18. The KC provides information not found elsewhere: "After so destroying Tiflis, they began laying waste, enslaving, exterminating, and destroying Somxit'i and Kambečian, the borders of Lori, K'art'li and Trialeti, Javaxet'i, Artahan, and parts of Tao and Samc'xe, the lands around Karnip'or and Ani. This chastisement and providential wrath continued for five years. For two years in the beginning [the Khwarazmians] destroyed the country, then for five years they remained in the city and destroyed the above-mentioned countries. Excepting fasts and fortresses, there were no other structures [left standing in the land]", KC pp. 178-79; Mur. pp. 66--67. Eventually Jalāl learned that the Mongols were approaching, so he left Tiflis for Azarbaijan, meanwhile urging the sultan of Xlat' the Caliph, and the sultan of Iraq to help him resist the enemy. They declined. "...guessing that his army and that of Atrpatakan would be unable to withstand, [Jalāl al-Din] quit Atrpatakan and again went as the fugitive to Tiflis", KC p. 182; Mur. p. 70. Rusudan summoned her army, opened the Darial Gates enabling northerners (probably Qipchaq Turks) to pour into Georgia, and sent this motley group against Jalāl, who was encamped in Bolnisi valley, Somxit'i. These royal troops were put to flight by the sultan who then went on to Tiflis, destroying", KC pp. 182-83; Mur. p.70.

retaken by the Caucasians, but Jalāl al-Dīn continued devastating one or another section of Armenia until 1230 when he was decisively beaten near Erzinjan by a united force composed of troops of Malik-Ashraf of Xlat', the Saljuq sultan of Rūm, Kai-Qubād, Cilician and Crusader detachments¹. Jalāl was murdered the next year by a Kurdish peasant². His raids and devastations

1

PT pp. 129-30; HAP III p. 605; Abu'l-Fida (Nalb. pp. 233-24); Ibn Bibi pp. 154-74; Yov.Yiğ., appendix, #11 pp. 1031-32; VT p. 75. KG's information is found in chp. 19 of his History, "Concerning the Destruction of Sultan Jalal al-Din and His Death". According to this source, after Jalal had defeated the ruler of Xlat', Malik-Ashraf, he married the latter's wife T'amt'a, who was the daughter of Iwane. As Jalal went on to ruin other districts under the sway of 'Ala al-Din, sultan of Rūm, the latter mustered a mixed army including Egyptians, Cilician Armenians and Franks. Supposedly, although there were less than a thousand Cilician Armenians and Franks, it was due to their valour that Jalal al-Din's army was routed, KG pp. 228-29.

"Now sultan Jalal al-Din returned to the land of Albania to the fruitful and fertile Mughan plain, in great shame. He encamped there and wanted to assemble an army. However, the T'at'ars who had expelled him from his own country as a fugitive pursued him and chased him as far as Amit' (Amida), where they ferociously struck his forces. The impious prince died in that very battle. But some say he went on foot thence as a fugitive, and that a man chanced upon him and recognized him as the one who had earlier slain one of his relations, and so killed him to avenge his relative's blood. Thus did the evil one die, wickedly " KG p. 230.

2

SMP p. 335; KG pp. 229-30 (see note 1 above); VA: "After committing many crimes, he turned upon Xlat', took it, and enriched with booty went to Rūm against sultan 'Ala al-Din and Malik-Ashraf. However he suffered a great defeat in battle and fled with a few [followers] to Mughan, that plain so suited for all human and animal needs. Then the T'at'ars--who had thrown him out of his country earlier--fell upon him suddenly and thence put him to flight to Amids. Either he died inadvertently while fleeing, or he fell to the T'at'ar sword, or else, as is said, one of

had lasted seven years. Not only did he bring mass destruction of human life and property, but also famine and pestilence, since, as Step'annos Orbēlean noted, Jalāl al-Dīn and his unruly troops frequently cut down fruit trees and vineyards and burned the crops¹.

[Jalāl's] own people whose relation had been killed summarily was disgruntled on this account and also because of the uncomfortable movings about of [the army] which he had caused. And so vengeance was exacted for the blood of the innocent that had been spilled" (VA pp. 143-44).

The KC: "Hearing this [news of the capture of Ganjak by the Mongols], the sultan hurriedly arose with his family and fled to Rum. Meanwhile the Tatars were pursuing him and reached Basen. As soon as [the Khwarazmian army] saw the coming of [the Mongols], they scattered. The sultan even was left alone. He reached some insignificant village and fell asleep under the trees. By chance, someone saw him and killed him. The sultan's belt, saddle and quiver were adorned with great gems for which that lefty and renowned ruler was slain....When the Khwarazmians dispersed, many fled to Garmian while sultan Jalāl al-Dīn was killed. With this, the great kingdom essentially was ended" (KC p. 185; Mur. pp. 71-72). Abu'l-Fida (Nalb. pp. 233-34) claims that the murderers were Kurdish brigands.

¹ SO p. 146; Ibn Bibi describes the problems caused by the lingering Khwarazmian troops to the settled Saljuq rulers (pp. 178-84). He mentions an invasion by the sultan of Egypt in 1232 which was aided by the malik of Xarberd (pp. 184-90). The leaderless, dispersed Khwarazmians served as mercenaries in the armies of different rulers (pp. 220-22). According to BH, some 10,000 Khwarazmians were settled by 'Ala'al-Dīn, but he does not say where (BH p. 397).

BH speaks of the Mongols invading the Xarberd area of southern Armenia around 1230. These were most likely detachments returning from the pursuit of Jalāl al-Dīn: "Then a legion of the Tatars invaded the country of the fortress of Zaid [Xarberd] and it came on as far as the Buphrates, which is in Melitene, and it crossed the plain of Hanazit. And because the whole population through their terror had fled to the places and towns which were disaffected and the fortresses, there was not much destruction. And those Tatars went back and ruled over Adhorbijan and Shaharzur, and they subjugated the Iberians also" (BH pp. 396-97). Ibn Bibi (pp. 175-78) speaks of Mongols raiding as far as Sebastia/Sivas in 1230.

Following the deaths of king Georgi IV Laša (1223) and Iwanē Zak'arean (1227), Christian Caucasia, already seriously weakened now lost the possibility of united resistance against attackers, and this at the very moment when it was needed most.

The fourth invasion of Armenia occurred in 1236. It was short and merciless, and confined to the northeastern and northern regions. In that year the Mongol general Chormaghun, now established at the Mongol summer camp in the Mughān plain of Āzarbāijān, sent out detachments under various commanders to capture all the key fortresses in northeastern Armenia¹. Unlike the first appearance of the

In the period from 1230 to the reappearance of the Mongols in western Armenia, the situation there was hardly stable. BH records that the fortress-cities of Xarberd and Xlat constantly were passing back and forth among Muslim rivals (BH pp. 400-401). In the early 1230's we see Armenians and Georgians fighting in the armies of the Saljuq sultan in Palestine (BH p. 400). The same author records a famine in western Armenia around 1234 (BH p. 401). In the late 1230's, Khwarazmian remnants still were powerful enough to give sultan Ghiyath al-Din problems, ravaging Samosata and Xarberd (BH p. 403; VT p. 77); Armenian colophons also speak of Mongol raids in western Armenia prior to 1236. See Yov.Yiğ., #403 p. 878, #405 pp. 882-83.

1

HAP III pp. 606-607; SEPHA p. 103; CAMA p. 360; Kirakos' History contains considerable information on the conquest of parts of Caucasia prior to the submission of certain princes. After noting the establishment of the Mongols in Mughan, he commences in ch. 21 with an account of the capture and destruction of Gaujak, a city then densely settled with Muslim Persians:

"Immediately the Tatar army arrived and besieged Gaujak on all sides, battling it with numerous war machines. They struck the orchard which surrounded the city. Then they demolished the city wall using catapults on all sides.

However, none of the enemy entered the city. They simply remained there, fully armed, for a week guarding it" (KG p. 236). Many of the residents then burned down their houses and killed themselves. "When the enemy observed this, they became furious and put everyone to the sword: man, woman, and child. And no one escaped them but for a small brigade, armed and fully prepared which broke through one part of the wall at night and fled. Some few dregs were also spared and tortured to reveal where the treasures were kept. Then they killed some of them and took the rest captive. They then dug through the charred homes and removed whatever/whomever they found there. And they were occupied with this for many days, and then departed.

"The T'at'ars then circulated through all the districts around the city to dig up and hunt for goods and wares. They discovered many things made of gold, silver, copper, and iron, as well as various garments which had been hidden in cellars and subterranean chambers.

"And so the city remained desolate for four years. They then commanded that it be rebuilt, and a few people slowly assembled there and rebuilt it, except for the wall.

Ch . 22. Concerning the Destruction of the Lands of Armenia and Georgia by the Same Army.

"A few years after the destruction of Ganjak this fanatical and wily army divided up by lot all the lands of Armenia, Georgia, and Albania, each chief according to his importance receiving cities, districts, lands and fortresses in order to take, demolish and ruin them. And each went to his allotted area with his wives, sons and army baggage, where he remained without a care, polluting and eating all the green plants with camels and livestock" (KG pp. 236-37). Kirakos then notes that Georgia was in a weakened condition as a result of the misrule of Rusudan whom he characterizes as a lascivious woman. "Rusudan exercised the authority through the commanders Iwane and his son Awag; Sahnsah, son of Zak'are; Vahram [of Gag] and others". Iwane died and his position was taken by Awag. "And since they were unable to withstand that great blizzard [of Mongols] which had come, they all betook themselves to fortresses, wherever they were able. The Mongols spread throughout the plains, mountains, and valleys like a multitude of locusts or like torrential rains pouring down on the land" (KG pp. 237-38).

Mongols in the Caucasus which had been for the pursuit of a fugitive, their reappearance now was for the purpose of conquest and occupation. On this occasion, the Mongols travelled with their families, carts, and herds--their "portable economy"¹. Upon receiving news of the return of the Mongols, the ruler of Georgia, queen Rusudan (1223-47) with many of the naxarar/didebuls fled to the security of western Georgia, while others secured themselves in their fortresses. But no one was secure. Molar-noyin took the territories of Iwanē's nephew Vahram of Gag: Samk'or, Sagam, Tērunakan, Ergevank', Gag, Tawuš, Kacaret', K'awazin. The Kiwrikan fortresses of Macnaberd and Nor Berd fell, and about the same time the clerical historians Vanakan and Kirakos Ganjakec'i were captured. Ghatagha-noyin took Gardman, Çarek', Getabek, and Vardanašat. Ghaghatai-noyin took the Zak'arid holdings of Lofi; and soon Dmanis, Šamsulde and Tiflis fell. Iwanē's son Awag surrendered when his fortress of Kayean was besieged by Dughata-noyin. Upper and Lower Xaçen were taken by Jughbugha, while Aslan-noyin took the Siwnik' district².

1
CAMA p. 361.

2
HAP III pp. 607-609; SEFHA pp. 104-105; 107-108; CAMA pp. 361-63; KG pp. 239-50; VA p. 145; GA pp. 294, 296; KC 186-87, Mur. pp. 72-73. For translations of these passages see the notes to ch. 3.

As will be seen in the next chapter, in many cases the local Armenian princes, instead of resisting surrendered to the Mongols, were spared, reinstated in their holdings and sometimes even promoted. However, surrender did not always elicit Mongol sympathy. Fearing the harsh fate suffered by Ani, Kars surrendered but was devastated nonetheless¹. Surmari was attacked and ravaged. Shīrvān fell². Thus, during the course of 1236 the Mongols

1

HAP III p. 610; SEPHA p. 107; CAMA p. 362; Yov.Yiš., pp. 909-911, #416 p. 917; #422 p. 936; KG: The submission of a few eastern Armenian princes did not bring a halt to the Mongols' conquering activity. Chormaghun took Awag and his troops and marched against Ani. First he sent envoys telling the people to surrender. "Those who were the principals of the city did not dare respond to [Chormaghun's] message without asking prince Šahnšah, since the city was under his authority. Now the mob in the city with the famiks (rabble) killed Chormaghun's delegation". Chormaghun battled with siege machinery and took the city, generally killing the population "sparing only a few women and children and some artisans whom they led into captivity. Then they entered the city, took all the goods and possessions, looted all the churches, ruined and destroyed the whole city and corrupted the glory of its comeliness" (KG p. 258).

In ch . 28 Kirakos describes the sack of Kars. Kars surrendered its keys, "but because the T'at'ars were anxious for booty and feared no one, they did there the same as they had done in Ani...

"The same army also took the city of Surb Mari [Surmalu] which several years earlier Šahnšah and Awag had taken from the Tačiks. And while [the inhabitants] were yet licking their wounds, suddenly a certain one of the nobles named šara Bahatur came upon them with many troops and quickly took the city, ravishing all that he found in it" (KG p. 260).

2

HAP III p. 610; SEPHA p. 107.

subjugated by sword or treaty all of northeastern and northern Armenia. They met with no serious resistance anywhere.

The Mongol conquest of western and southern Armenia took place between 1242 and 1245. These lands, it will be remembered, though inhabited by Armenians were under the political domination of the Saljuqs or, in the case of Xlat', of the Ayyūbids¹. In 1242 Baiju-noyin (the successor of the former supreme commander Chormaghun who had lost his hearing) took Karin/Erzerum after a siege of two months. The population was massacred and led away into slavery². The Mongols spent the winter of 1243 at

1
See pp. 63-64 above.

2
HAP III p. 611; SEPHA p. 109; PT p. 137; Ibn Bibi describes how the rulers of Xlat' and Erzerum were arguing over money for hiring mercenaries to defend themselves (Ibn Bibi pp. 222-37); BH describes the taking of Erzerum (p. 406). During 1242 the Mongols looted as far south as Xarberd (BH pp. 406-407). KG: "As soon as Baiju assumed authority he forthwith mustered troops from all the peoples under his domination and went to that part of Armenia under the domination of the sultan of Rum". He besieged Karin and invited the city to surrender. Receiving a negative reply, Baiju broke down the walls with siege machinery and destroyed the city. "And at that time the city was very heavily populated being filled not only with Christians and Tačiks, but all the people from the whole district had assembled there [for protection].
"In the city were countless holy gospels [belonging to] the great and the small. The foreigners took these and sold the expensive ones to the Christians in their army cheaply. In glee they spread through each district, dividing up the churches and monasteries. May Christ reward the Christian princes Awag, Šahnšah, Vahram's son Ałbuła, pious Dop's son Grigor Kačenc'i, and their troops. For these princes bought out of slavery as many men, women, and children, bishops, priest and eacons as was possible" (KG pp. 279-80); GA pp. 307, 309.

their base in Āzarbāijān, but returned in springtime to crush the forces of the Saljuq sultan of Rūm, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai Khusrāu at Kōse Dagh/Chmankatuk near Erzinjan¹. The

1

See A.G. Galstyan's Armenian article in PBH #1(1964) and the English translation of it "The First Armeno-Mongol Negotiations" in the Armenian Review vol. XXIX (1976) pp. 26-37 [Hereafter FAMN]. FAMN pp. 27-29; SEPHA pp. 110-11. BH p. 407 describes the battle of Chmankatuk, as does Abu'l-Fida (Nalb. p. 234). Ibn Bibi describes the defeat, and the subsequent "unfriendliness" of the Cilician Armenians in surrendering the sultan's refugee mother to the Mongols (Ibn Bibi pp. 222-37).

KG: "The sultan had left his usual place and had come to that part of Armenia which was under his domination, hard by a village called Çman-katuk.

"General Baiju, consistent with his deep knowledge, divided his soldiers into many fronts, putting foremost those under the brave commanders while the foreign troops composed of various nationalities who had come with them he divided so that they would not work any treachery" (KG p. 282); Vardan Arewelc'i's account of the taking of western Armenia is quite brief, mentioning neither the Armeno-Georgian auxiliaries nor the tactics used in battle: "88. Now in the year 1243 Baiju-novyn replaced the authority of Chormaghun and took the city of Karin, taking thence Umek, a man venerable, wealthy (mecatun) and fearful of the Lord, as well as his relations, the sons of paron Yohann, Step'annos and his five brothers. In 1244 [Baiju conquered] the whole territory of Rūm and the notable cities, first Caesarea, then Sebastia [whose people] were spared destruction since they had submitted early, then Erznka which was mercilessly destroyed and enslaved, for it had resisted. [The Mongols also took] many lands and districts where especially the Armenian people [were to] dwell in distree" (VA p. 147).

GA: "The commander of the army was Baiju-novyn, a man successful in battle, achieving many victories wherever he met resisters. But the causes of victory were the Armenian and Georgian princes who were in the front lines and launched themselves with a mighty blow against the enemy. Then, after them, came the T'at'ars, with bow and arrow". Georgians were not only fighting on the Mongols' side. Aknerc'i notes that the son of Salue, who had been with the sultan of Rūm for a long time, fought in the sultan's army. "When the battle waxed fierce, the courageous and renowned son of Salue put to flight the T'at'ars and killed many of them". Aknerc'i also praises the fighting ability of Ałbuza, son of Vahram, grandson of Plu Zak'are, fighting on the Mongols' side. At nightfall

the battle of Chmankatuk ended. The next morning the Mongols discovered that Ghiyath al-Din had fled (GA pp. 307-309).

Het'um's unusual account of the taking of eastern Asia Minor shows numerous marks of a writer not well acquainted with the details. In chp. 18, "Regarding Ogedei, Second Khan of the Tatars" he recounts a number of Mongol battles with "the Turks", but Het'um appears to have merged Jalal al-Din with the sultan of Rum. After 10,000 Mongols were put to flight by the Turks, Ogedei sent general Baiju (Payton) "with 30,000 Tatar soldiers called damak or reconnaissance troops... Now when Baiju with the 30,000 soldiers reached the kingdom of the Turks, travelling day by day, he learned that the sultan from whom the first Tatars had fled had died, and that his son named K'iadati (? Ghiyath) had succeeded him. When the former heard about the coming of the Tatars he was horrified and summoned as many mercenary troops as he could from foreigners and from the Latins. He had in his service among others, 2,000 Latins led by two commanders named Yohanes Liminad from Cyprus, and the other, Vonipakios born in Genoa. [The Turkish sultan] also sent to neighboring sultans promising anyone who came favors and gifts. And thus gathering a great multitude of warriors, he went to the place where the Tatars were encamped. However the Tatars were in no way disturbed. Instead they valiantly waged war as far as Konedrak. In the end the Tatars were the victors and the Turks were defeated in a masterly fashion. In this way the Tatars captured the kingdom of the Turks in the year of Our Lord 1244 (Het'um pp. 40-41).

The KC relates the conquest of western Armenia and the sending to the Mongols by Rusudan other son David as events occurring simultaneously. Queen Rusudan sent as messengers to the Mongols Sahnsah, Awag, Vahram, and the erist'ay (duke) of Heret'i, Sota. "While the queen was sending her son [to the Mongols], they had decided to campaign against the great sultan Ghiyath al-Din, by origin a Saljuq, master of Rum, to subjugate him. They sent Baiju-novin who took with him the very preatest princes of Georgia. When they reached the countries of Sebastia and Erznka, they started to loot". The sultan approached the Mongols with an army of 400,000 (!) commanded by two Georgians, "Sarvaršis-je of Abxazia called Dard who had great renown from the very first for his bravery and had remained firm in the faith; and with him was P'ardavlay son of Salva Axalc'ixeli-T'or-eli, who had fled to the sultan and was a brave man, renowned in warfare" (KC pp. 191-92; Mur. pp. 76-77). The KC then describes the boasting of Mongol subject Sargis Jaiel, Ivarivare's grandson before Baiju. The Georgians were all appointed as advance-attackers. "Now the Georgians fought better and more bravely than any. A fierce battle ensued and countless men were killed on the sultan's side, including Sarvaršis-je called Dard Abxaz, their general. The sultan's army took to flight and the Tatars and Georgians

The defeat of the Saljuqs at Kōse Dagh was an event of the greatest significance for the Armenians both locally, and abroad in the independent state of Cilicia. Like dominoes the remaining key cities of central Asia Minor fell: Erzinjan, Caesarea, Sebastia/Sīvās, Melitene/Malatya, and Divrigi¹. In 1245 Baiju captured Xlat', Amida, Edessa,

pursued, killing numberless warriors and taking captives. But Axalc'ixel was killed by the sultan for revenge against the Georgians....The Georgians and Tatars swelled up with all sorts of extraordinary cloths and clothing, and so many horses, asses and camels that it is impossible to count them" (KC p. 194; Mur. p. 78).

¹ HAP III p. 611; SEPHA p. 110; PT p. 138; BH described the taking of Sebastia/Sivas: "And they came to Sebastia, and the people who were therein made terms with them, and they brought out much gold and bought their own souls from slaughter, and their sons and daughters from slavery. And the Tatars went into the city, and sacked the royal treasuries, and whatsoever pleased them they took, and the weapons of war they burned, and they wrecked four (or forty) cubits of the [top of the] wall all round the city.

"And another chief went to Caesarea, and the inhabitants thereof did not wish to surrender it. Then they all gathered together against it, and they breached its wall with engines of war, and they went in, and sacked the royal treasuries, and burned the wonderful houses and buildings. And they tortured the nobles and the free men, and they stabbed them with swords until they had stripped them of all their money. And after that they killed therein many tens of thousands of people, and carried off the young men and the young women into captivity" (BH p. 407). The same author provides unique information on the taking of Melitene/Malatya (BH pp. 408-409) See also Ibn Bibi (pp. 222-37), Yov. Yiṣ., #436 pp. 959-60; #437 p. 961; VT p. 84.

KG pp. 282-84; GA: "And then the next day [after Chmankatuk] filled with great joy, they attacked the land of Rum. First they took Erznka and left ṣahna (guards). Then they took Caesarea and wrought much bloodshed in it because the town did not surrender, but resisted the Tatars in battle. For there was much cavalry stationed in it, and it was filled with goods. They did not surrender the town willingly, so the wily Tat'ar army took it by treachery, generally killing off the grandees and, mercilessly did they capture the lesser folk with all their goods.

and Nisibis¹. By that year the Armenian populations, be they in Caucasian Armenia, western Armenia, southern Armenia, or even Cilician Armenia were to a greater or lesser degree all formally under the overlordship of the Mongols. A unique situation had been created.

During the more than 100 years of Mongol domination, the Armenians experienced periods of benevolent, even enlightened, rule and of capricious, benighted misrule. From 1236-43 Mongol rule resulted in little if any radical change in the lives of Caucasian Armenians. As was mentioned above, many if not most of the naxarars retained control of their lands. Probably Mongol garrisons were maintained in the key cities, but, as was the case during the Saljuq conquests, it seems unlikely that there would have been enough troops to police all areas. During this early period the sources unanimously note that the Mongols returned each winter to the warm Mughān plain of Āzarbāijān, so for part of the year the majority of them were outside of Armenia (though hardly very far away)². Apparently, prior to 1243 no permanent

Once more they took Konya and Axšar with all the greatest villages and monasteries. Then they attacked Sewast and took it, warring. But they did not kill them, rather they took their goods as booty" (GA pp. 307-309).

1

HAP III p. 612; SEPHA p. 111; KG pp. 292-93.

2

See following page, note 1.

formal taxes had been imposed on Armenia, the conquerors contenting themselves instead with the rich booty and plunder to be had from the many areas taken by military force¹. But the sources maintain that in 1243 by command

¹ HAP III ch . 36 pp, 614-27, L.H.Babayan, "Hayastana monkolakan tirapetut van arajin arjanum [Armenia in the First Period of the Mongol Domination]", p. 617; SEPHA pp. 119-26; Kirakos has a number of valuable remarks about early Mongol administrative-fiscal policies in Armenia and Georgia prior to Arghun's census of 1243/44. When speaking about the battle for certain eastern Armenian fortresses in 1236, he says: "Meanwhile the army of foreigners battled with the fortresses. Those inside them unwillingly provided the Mongols with horses, livestock and whatever else they demanded. The Mongols placed taxes over them and left them in their name" (KG p. 243). Chp. 24 describes the capture of Vanakan yardapet and his student, the author himself. When the Mongols were besieging the cave where Vanakan was holed up, the following message was relayed: "From outside the enemies shouted: 'Why do you want to die? Come out to us, we shall give you overseers and leave you in your places'. They repeated this a second and third time, with pledges" (KG p. 244). Upon the conclusion of Molar-noyin's interview with Vanakan, "Molar-noyin ordered him to bring down the people of the fortress there fearlessly and he promised that each would be left in his place with his overseers and that he would build villages and fields (agaraks) in his name" (KG p. 246). Some of the captives, however, such as Kirakos and Vanakan were not "left in their places": "...Then they selected men from among us who could go about with them. The rest they ordered taken to the monastery and to the village and left their overseers there so that no one else would search them" (KG p. 248). That same year (1236) the Mongols took Lofi whose prince, Sahnghah had fled: "They discovered the treasures of prince Sahnghah which those obedient to him had taken and robbed, and the T'at'ars constructed there a sturdy treasury which no one could see, since they made the mouth of the pit narrow enough that it was sufficient only for casting treasure in, but not for taking anything out" (KG p. 253). "...Then they came to Sebastia and since the inhabitants of the city had surrendered in advance--coming out to them with gifts and presents--no one was blamed, although a part of the city was looted. Conquering the city in their own name they set up overseers and left" (KG p. 283). VA and SO have nothing to say on this topic.

Grigor Aknerc'i's first mention of an administrative deed

follows the agreement of the princes to pay the mal and tagar taxes and to contribute soldiers to the army: "The Tatars, agreeing to this, left off killing and destroying the land. They then returned to their place, the Mughan country. However, they left a chief named Lara Buła to demolish all the country's fortresses which they had taken. They destroyed the foundations the impregnable fortresses built by the Tačiks at great cost" (GA p. 296). While in Mughan, the three commanders Chormaghun, Benc and Mular held a quiriltai at night with the latter two urging the killing of all the population in a new expeditions.

Chormaghun, however, urged peace: "There has been enough destruction and killing in the land. Let it remain cultivated (šen). They can cultivate it, giving half for us to live on, from the vineyards and fields, and keeping half for themselves" (GA p. 298). Mysteriously, the next day, two of the warlike commanders were found dead. Chormaghun, the survivor, went to "Chingiz" and explained. The Khan mentions that it is God's will for the Mongols to take the world, maintain order, impose the yağax and collect izzu, mal tagar, and ip'čur taxes. The Khan gave Chormaghun his wife Aylt'ana khatun and sent him back to the Caucasus, to Mughan, with 110 chiefs:

"Then they held a quiriltai (xufut ay) and a great council at Chormaghun's order, and they divided the countries among the 110 chieftains. Dividing the land into three parts, one group went north, one south and one directly through the country...

"Now the names of those chieftains who remained in the middle of the country were: Asut'u-novyn who was the pakr (? "bone", "relative") of the Khan; Čalatay who was called khan; Sanit'ay; another junior Čalatay; Baču-novyn (Baiju) whom they placed as the head of all the troops; Asar-novyn; Hut't'u-novyn; T'ut'tu-novyn; Awgawt'ay-novyn; Xojar-novyn; Kurumči-novyn; Xunan-novyn; T'enal-novyn; Angurag-novyn.

"These same 13 chiefs divided amongst themselves the land of Georgia and Albania, mountain and plain. And they brought the great House of Chormaghun to Ganjak šahastan which previously was destroyed but later restored" (GA p. 302).

Aknerč'i next describes the capture of Vanak, the destruction of Karin/Erzerum, the victory of Čhmantakuk and following that the capture of Ergznjan "where they left šahna (guards)" (GA p. 310), the destruction of Caesarea, and the capture of Konya and Axšar. "Then they attacked Sebastia and took it by seige, but they did not kill the population. Rather, they took their belongings as booty, counted the men, imposed their customary mal and t'alar taxes, left šahna and chieftains for the country of Rum, and returned to Azarbaijan (GA p. 312).

According to the KC, the first administrative move made by the Mongols occurred after Awag's submission. "He went to Chormaghun, Čaghatai, Bičo (Baiju?) and Yusur who saw [him] and honored him, became intimately acquainted and appointed guards for [his] cities. In their language these are called šan". Subsequently Šahnšah submitted:

of the Great Khān Güyük himself, taxes amounting to between 1/30th and 1/10th ad valorem, were imposed on virtually everything movable and immovable and a heavy head tax of 60 silver drams was collected from males¹.

"They appointed guards for the interior of the country" (KC p. 190; Mur. p. 75). The capture and killing of the disobedient continued until finally Iwane C'ixiajvarel--Jaleli submitted: "Iwane went and met Chaghatai who received him with honor and appointed guards for the country.

"When they had secured the entire land in this fashion, they divided it among the four rulers (noyins) as well as (=included in the division) all the erist avs (dukes), their incomes and taxes which they took and sent. In this way the country began to be pacified, gradually" (KC p. 191; Mur. p. 76).

The subsequent chronology here seems to be somewhat confused. The KC next describes the campaign against Ghiyath al-Din, adding: "while the queen was sending her son [to the Mongols]...harassed by the fighting [and after the capture of Konya], the sultan requested peace and promised to pay heavy and great taxes, and giving many gifts, huge gems, pearls, he calmed them down and requested guards. And for a certain time they would have no sultan until the best was chosen" (KC pp. 194-95; Mur. pp. 77-78).

¹ HAP III p. 620; CAMA pp. 365-66; VT pp. 88,91. KG's information is found in his chp. 44: "As soon as Khan Güyük took control of the great kingdom of the T'at'ar army in their own land, he forthwith sent out tax-collectors to his troops in various lands and regions which they had subdued, to take 1/10th (tasanord) of all the military property as well as taxes from the districts and kingdoms conquered by them: from the Persians, Tačiks, Armenians, Georgians, Albanians, and from all peoples under them" (KG pp. 311-12). The chiefs of the tax-collectors were Arghun and Buqa, the latter even confiscating goods from a terrified Mongol nobility: "Yet no one dared say anything to him, for he had assembled brigands from among the Persians and Tačiks who mercilessly performed deeds of cruelty and were especially inimical toward the Christians.

"Therefore they provoked him against the pious prince Hasan Jalal. [Buqa] seized him in the great court, before all the nobles and subjected him to numerous punishments. He demolished [Hasan's] inaccessible fortresses: the one called in Persian Xoyaxana, Ded, Ciranak'ar and his other fortresses. And they so levelled them that not even a trace appeared that anything had ever been built there. Taking much gold and silver from [Hasan] they barely spared

The severity of the taxes and the brutal manner of their collection triggered an abortive uprising of the naxarar/didebula in 1248/49. This rebellion, which was discovered by the Mongols while still in the planning stages was crushed at the expense of human and animal lives and crops in numerous districts of northeastern Armenia and southern Georgia. Some of the arrested Armenian and Georgian conspirators, unable to raise the huge ransoms demanded for their release were tortured or killed¹. But the main

his life. The great nobility (mecamec awagani) could do nothing to help him, so thrown into fear were all the spectators" (KG p. 313). Buqa also planned to seize the prince of princes Awag, but the great nobility (presumably Mongol nobility) urged him to visit Buqa with his large personal army, saying: "Should [Buqa] happen to seize you, then you attack him". Seeing Awag's troops the frightened Buqa asked: "What is that multitude of soldiers for? Could it be that you are rebelling from the Khan and have come to kill us"? Buqa then spoke to Awag of peace, while simultaneously plotting against him. But before Buqa was able to actualize his designs, he died of disease (KG p. 314).

Grigor Aknerc'i does not mention the census of 1243 directly. However, describing the taking of Sebastia/Sivās in 1244 he writes: "But they did not kill them, rather took their treasures as booty and registered the populace and imposed taxes on them according to their custom, the mal and t'sar. And leaving šahna (guards) and chiefs in the land of Rum..." (GA p. 312).

¹ HAP III pp. 620-22; SEPHA pp. 131-32; CAMA p. 366; In chp. 47, "Concerning the Destruction Wrought by the T'at'ars in Georgia", Kirakos narrates the princes' rebellion of 1249/50: "While the land was recovering a little from the raids and plunderings stirred up by the earth-consuming fire...the princes deprived and robbed the poor, and from this extortion they bought expensive clothing and they dressed, ate, drank, and boasted greatly as is the arrogant custom of Georgia" (KG p. 318). Kirakos rebukes those who "do not learn from the past", and he considers the instigator of the rebellion to be Satan. "...Suddenly all the nobility of the T'at'ar army held a council, armed, and wanted universally to ravage the lands of Armenia and Georgia, [lands] obedient to them, because the Georgian

king wanted to rebel with all the princes, and [the Mongols] were recruiting to come and destroy them, since it was apparent that all the princes were going for a levee to the king of Georgia, Dawit', in Tiflis.

"And while they were drinking wine, their spirits rose and an immature man among them said: 'Having such a multitude of troops, why do we serve [the Mongols]? Come, let us fall upon them suddenly, destroy and exterminate them, and we shall have our lands'.

"The great prince Awag intercepted this plot. And the T'atar army happening to be in the place was informed about it, and the army notified its chiefs.

"As soon as the forces of the princes each went to its own place thus armed, they [the Mongols] wanted generally to destroy everyone. The princes they found with them, they arrested and to those who were not there they sent summons for them to come in haste...

"...One of the senior leaders, general Chaghatai, head of the entire army and a friend of Awag, came amidst the armed troops and said to them: 'We have no order from the Khan to kill those who are obedient to us, stand in service to us, and pay taxes to the Khan. And the reality of their rebellion is not certain. But if we destroy them without cause you will be responsible to the Khan'. Hearing this they ceased following the matter.

"The mother of Awag, named Xoşak, went to them to assure them of her son's loyalty to them and that he soon would be coming--which in fact happened, since prince Awag quickly came up and demonstrated his intimacy with them by many testimonies.

"King Dawit' and the other princes arrives. [The Mongols] bound all of them tightly, according to their custom, hand and foot, with thin cords. They left them bound thus for three days, ridiculing and insulting them for their arrogance and rebellious plans. And they took all [the rebels'] horses, put a price on their heads, and left them. [The Mongols] attacked Georgia, falling upon many districts of the rebels and non-rebels. They cut down many people and took even more captive, a countless multitude of men, women, and children they drowned in the river. And this took place in 1249/50 (698 A.E.)" (KG pp. 319-20).

VA: "...For a census was conducted in 1243/44 by which they worked deeds worthy of lamentation and tears not merely for [the sake of] rational animals, but for dumb animals, mountains and plains, which were watered with blood and tears. This same lamentation was repeated in 1249/50 because Baiju and the other nobles got wind of the presumptuousness and rebelliousness of the king and the princes of Georgia. King Dawit' was arrested as were other grandees; they were bound and sentenced to death, though they were spared by concern from On High. Nonetheless, countless numbers were killed and enslaved, villages and fields [were destroyed], and they disgraced women in Armenia--but more so in Georgia" (VA pp. 147-48).

Aknerc'i's narration of the rebellion is found in his chp. IX. Like Kirakos, Aknerc'i noted that it was a Georgian custom to boast: "Now one of the Georgian princes counted the other princes in front of the king and declared the number of princes to be 1000. And some of the princes had 1000 horsemen for battle, while some had 500. The news of this spread throughout the entire kingdom, while they carelessly ate and drank. When they had counted and taken stock of the Armenian and Georgian forces, they said that their side would vanquish the T'at'ar troops. And they divided the chiefs amongst themselves. But this was not spoken straightforwardly, rather, in jest, for they were at leisure and free from care, and there was no enemy in the eastern land besides the Tat'ars who kept coming and through taxation harassing the Georgian and Armenian princes. From some they demanded gold cloth, from some falcons, from some alék ("well-bred") dogs and horses. And in this way they harassed them over and above the mal, t'azar and xalan" (GA p. 320). Aknerc'i says that a certain unnamed traitorous prince went and informed the Mongols.

"Now they, believing these false words, turned against the land, taking as plunder all the goods and flocks. But they did not kill people, [being] without orders from the great Khan. They seized the king and all the princes of the nation, while they even took to the court of the chieftain the great prince of Georgia, Awag, At'abak Iwvané's son, on a litter, since he had fallen ill in those days and was unable to ride a horse. Although the other princes and the king spoke a great deal, they did not believe them, and did not cease making captives and looting the land. But when they took Awag on a litter to the court of the Tat'ar chieftain(s) he spoke and was believed; they left off destroying the land and made peace with the terrified and pitiful Christians" (GA p. 322).

Step'annos Orbelean omits any reference to the princes' rebellion. The account in the KC for the period 1243-50 is extremely confused chronologically. Dating, as usual, is absent, and beyond this, many events are telescoped. The chronicler laments the confused state of affairs following the death of queen Rusudan in 1247. During this time, the Georgian army was obliged to fight each year against the Assassins at Alamut, to fulfill military service to the Mongols. Furthermore, with the country kingless, Turks began attacking the Vazarškert area. Then, with Georgia in confusion, the Georgian princes assembled at Koxtaat'avi, complaining about their yearly fighting obligations at Alamut. They decided to rebel against the Mongols. Present were Egarstan, Dadiani, Vahram of Gag, Ivarivare, Sot'a Kubar, T'orian, the Her-Kaxet'is, the K'art'lec'is, Gamerkel T'oreli, Sargis T'mogveli, the Mesxs and people of Tao. However the noyins Baiju and Angurag arrested those at Koxta and sent them to Sirakavan, where Chormaghun had them bound. They claimed they had assembled to pay the khara tax. But they were not released until one of the

causes of the unrest remained unaddressed by the Mongols.

After the accession of the Great Khān Mōngke (1251-59) a thorough census was made of all parts of the empire during 1252-57¹. The Iranian emir Arghun personally conducted the census of Caucasia in 1254. Although the study made by Arghun has not survived, modern scholars estimate the Armenian population of Greater Armenia (excluding Cilicia) to have been about 4 million in the mid-13th century². The thoroughness of Arghun's work boded ill for Armenian laborers. Kirakos Ganjakec'i

instigators, C'otne Dadiani, came all the way from Abxazia voluntarily, and repeated the same story (KC pp. 211-16; Mur. pp. 90-94).

1

SMP pp. 339-40.

2

HAP III p. 625; VA p. 148 merely mentions the census. Aknerc'i provides information not met with in the other Armenian sources: "In one small village [the Mongols] counted 30 or 50 men all from 15 to 60 years of age. They took 60 spitaks from each person counted. When they captured one who had fled or hid, they cruelly tied his hands back and beat him with green rods until his body was all cut and caked with blood. Then they pitilessly let loose their ferocious dogs, which they had trained to eat human flesh, and they let them devour the miserable and impoverished Christians" (GA p. 325). The KC, though somewhat confused, has a passage which appears to relate to the census of 1254. It characterizes Arghun, strangely, as a just, honest adviser, quite the opposite of the Armenian sources. First Arghun was sent to the domains of Batu, north of the Caucasus: "to survey and record those soldiers and warriors who had gone with the senior and junior noyins campaigning, and to stipulate according to their worth the uluf, which is a gift for those who have taken to the road and recompense for horse and saddle" (KC p. 234; Mur. p. 107). Arghun then went to Qubilai-Khan in China where he engaged in the same work. "When he reached Hūlegū-Khan, the latter received him with honor and sent him to Georgia to king David, then on

described it as follows:

[Census-takers] also reached the lands of Armenia, Georgia, Albania, and the districts around them, and began recording all those from 11 years and up, excepting the women. And they demanded the most severe taxes, more than a man could bear. And people became impoverished. They harassed the people with unbelievable beatings, torments, and tortures. Those who hid were seized and killed. Those who were unable to pay the rate had their children taken to pay their debt, for [the census-takers] circulated around with Persian Muslim attendants... all the artisans, whether in the cities or in villages were taxed. Furthermore, fishermen of the seas and lakes, miners and blacksmiths and painters/plasterers [were taxed] ...And they alone profitted. They took all the salt mines in Koāba and in other regions.

Arghun similarly profitted greatly from the merchants and heaped up vast quantities of gold, silver, and precious stones. Thus everything became expensive and the lands became filled with lamentation and complaints. Then he left in charge of the lands a wicked governor (ostikan) who demanded the same amount every year by list, and in writing. 1

to Rūm to survey all of his holdings. When Arghun reached Georgia, all the inhabitants of David's kingdom were greatly menaced. They started surveying people and beasts fields, and plants, vineyards and vegetable gardens. From [each] 9 land-owning peasants it was ordered that 1 soldier should be provided. Thus David's kingdom provided by census to the Tatars 9 dumans, which is 9 x 10,000. [From each] village they stipulated gifts: to the Thousander one lamb and one drahkan (?); to the Ten Thousander, one sheep and two drahkan; for the horseman (?) 3 tetris daily (=a silver coin). He so stipulated and then went to Rūm Baghdad, and everywhere" (KC pp. 234-35; Mur. pp. 107-108).

1
 KG pp. 362-63: "ew zamenayn aruestagēts, et'ē i k'ālak's ew et e i giwās, zamenayn i harki kac uc in. Ayl ew zcovaks, ew zlics jknorsac, ew zerkat ahans, ew zdarbins, ew zšparars...ew ink eank miayn sahein. ew zamenayn ālahansn afin, or i Koāb ew or yayl koāmans koāmans.
"Na ew i vačarakanac bazum inč saheal, kutec'in ganjs sastiks oskwoy ew arcat oy ew akanc patuakanac. Ew ayspēs zamenesin ālac uc eal ew yayiw ew āsxarov lc eal zāsxarhs, t'ōzin čar ostikans i veray āsxarhac's znoyn pahanjei yamenayn ani, novin hamarov ew grov".

Another administrative change occurred regarding Armenia in the mid-13th century. This was the establishment of the Īl-Khānid Mongol state over the territory of Iran, and the inclusion of Caucasia into it, beginning in 1256. Prior to that time the Caucasus had formed a single administrative unit composed of five vilayets. Of these five, the first two were areas of Armenian population, namely 1) the Gurjistāni (Georgian) vilayet, and 2) the vilayet of Greater Armenia. The Gurjistāni vilayet consisted of eight tumans or districts each capable of providing 10,000 soldiers. Three of the eight tumans in the first vilayet were Armenian and included Ani, Kars, northeasternmost Armenia, Siwnik' and Arc'ax. The second vilayet, that of Greater Armenia embraced some of the quasi-independent Armenian principalities, such as the Mamikonean/T'ofnikeans of Sasun and the Arcrunid Xedenekeans of Vaspurakan. The center of this vilayet was Karin/Erzerum¹.

Following the granting of Iran as a hereditary appanage to Hūlegū-Khān in 1256, the situation was somewhat altered. First, Hūlegū chose as his residence Mūghān in Āzarbāijān which until then had been the camping grounds of Baiju-noyin. Hūlegū ordered the latter and all the

¹ HAP III pp. 614-16; SEPHA pp. 155-59.

nomadic Mongol and Turkmen warriors subordinate to him to evacuate the Caucasus, in order to create room for his own entourage. With considerable grumbling the displaced Baiju and his hosts moved westward, sacking the cities of Erzerum, Erzinjan Sīvās, Caesarea and Konya as they went¹. Almost simultaneously some of Chingiz-Khān's grandchildren descended on the Caucasus through the Caspian Gates in order to settle near their relation, Hūlegū.

1

CAMA p. 366; PT pp. 275-76; Bar Hebraeus describes Hūlegū's entourage (BH p. 419) and Baiju's move (BH p. 424). In 1256 the Melitene/Malatya area was attacked by Turkmens (BH p. 425) as well as by Baiju (BH pp. 426-27). The same author (p. 427) reports cannibalism in that city; KG p. 375; GA: "After this, when the year 706 A.E. (=1257/58) had come, there arrived from the East, where the great Khan was, 7 of the Khan's sons, each with a duman of cavalry and a duman is 30,000 [incorrect. The duman was 10,000]. They were named as follows: the first and greatest of them was Hulawu, who was a brother of Manku khan. The second, Kūl, called himself the brother of God and was not ashamed. The third was Balaxē, the fourth Tut'ar, the fifth, T'agudar, the sixth, Łatakan, and the seventh, Bawrakan. They were in disagreement amongst themselves, but were very fearless and eaters of men. On their journey they all came and travelled about in wagons, while they levelled the mountains and hills of the eastern country to facilitate the movement of their wagons and carts" (GA p. 327). Of the leaders mentioned by GA, Kūl it seems became a bandit and attacked certain monasteries in "the interior of the country". The monastery of Geret'i is mentioned especially (GA pp. 327, 329, 331).

KC: "Hūlegū arrived in Atrpatakan with 60,000 troops. Learning about this, the novins Chormaghun, Yusur, Baiju, and Angurak went to meet him, taking with them all the nobles of Georgia, especially Egarslan, to whom the entire Georgian nobility submitted, as if to a king. They met in Atrpatakan. Two [bodies] of Tatars were [thus] assembled: those who had come there before [i.e., at the time of the conquest of the Caucasus], who were called t'amber, and those who had come with Hūlegū-Khan...

"They came to the place known as Ala-Tagh [east of Lake Van in southern historical Armenia]. All his subjects came before him. He sat on the throne of the Khanate and they congratulated him according to their custom and called him Khan..." (KC pp. 222-23; Mur. p. 98).

This unruly group also caused much damage as it travelled, and extorted whatever it could from the sedentary population¹. The establishment of the Īl-Khānid state in 1256 brought about yet another change, albeit one somewhat more difficult to evaluate than the damage occasioned by nomads on the move. In the pre-Īl-Khānid period, those Armenian naxarars heading tumans in the two Caucasian vilayets had had direct access to the Great Khān of the Mongol empire in Qara-Qorum. Now, with the establishment of the Īl-Khānate (itself a vassal of the Great Khāns) these same nobles became as it were sub-vassals whose direct access to supreme and ultimate power was lost². On the other hand

1

KG: "To this Khān [Hülegü] went the very greatest chiefs from Batu's region: Lu, Balala, Tuthar, Latalan, for everyone honored Hülegü like a Khān. They obeyed him and feared him" (KG p. 377); KC: "During the same period other khans sent their sons to these parts. Called koun, they were: Batu's son Tur, Chaghatai-Khan's son Ušan, Lu, and from the T'ul clan, Bolaa, in order that the khans' sons rule the lands they arrived in and also take the taxes. Ogedei-Khan's grandson Hülegü, brother of Qubilai-Khan had come forth and was here [in the Caucasus]. When Hülegü saw these three kouns he received them and gave them the lands due, and thus did they remain in peace" (KC pp. 223-24; Mur. p. 99).

2

CAMA pp. 367-68.

the proximity of new powerful masters as of 1256, plus the information obtained by them from the census of 1254 had yet another immediate ramification for the Caucasus. Now the naxarars were obliged to participate in all military ventures of the Īl-Khānids on a regular ongoing basis, providing a specified number of troops yearly. Armenian and Georgian warriors fought in all the major Mongol campaigns in the Middle East from 1256 onward. This in turn resulted in the deaths or enslavements of large numbers of Christian Caucasians abroad, and, secondly in the absence of native defenders within the Caucasus itself, where they were needed to protect that area from the persistent raids and sorties of Mongols, Turks, and local rebels¹.

Heavy taxation, coupled with the onerous burden of military service in distant lands led, not unexpectedly, to rebellion. The second Armeno-Georgian rebellion occurred between 1259 and 1261. Though of longer duration than the rebellion of 1248/49, this one too eventually was brutally crushed².

¹ On the participation of Caucasian nobles in Īl-Khānid warfare, see ch. 3.

² HAP III, ch. 37, "Hayastane Hulavyan iṣṣanūt'yan tirapetut'yan nerk' o [Armenia under Hūlegūid Domination]" by L. H. Babayan, pp. 628-44, pp. 630-31; SEPHA pp. 137-39. Kirakos' information is found in his ch. 63, "Concerning the Death of Pious Prince Jalal": "Now the king of Georgia,

Dawit', son of Laša, who was subject to the T'at'ars, was placed into straits and wearied by the numerous and impossibly heavy taxes demanded of him, of all the princes, and of all the lands, which they could not bear. He left his city Tiflis, his throne, and everything he owned and fled to the depths of Ap'xazia and the fortresses of Suanet'ia. With him went many other great princes of districts who were harassed and harried, bankrupt, and who had mortgaged cities and districts but were still unable to satiate the evil leech-like appetite [of the Mongols]. So fraught, Dawit' fled, but he was unable to take with him his wife queen Gonc'a and his newborn son Demetre. He took along only his first born son Giorgi" (KG p. 389).

Arghun pursued him, but was unable to catch up. He destroyed and enslaved many Georgian districts, destroying the mausolea of the kings at Gelat'i and the kat'olikosate at Achor. Suddenly some 400 Georgian cavalry appeared and scared off the Mongols. "And Arghun became frightened and dared not so brazenly enter and search places. He returned to Hülegü planning wickedness in his heart. He seized the Georgian queen Gonc'a, her daughter Xoşak, the great prince Sahnşah, Hasan Jalal the lord of Kaçen and many others because of debts and taxes [owed]. These people gave much treasure and barely saved their lives" (KG p. 390). However Hasan Jalal was executed in 1261/62.

"Now it happened that Zak'are [Sahnşah's son] was with Arghun and his many troops in Georgia. And Zak'are went unbeknownst to Arghun and the other soldiers to see his wife who was with her father Sargis, prince of Uxteac', one of the rebels with the Georgian king Dawit'. When Arghun learned about this, he notified Hülegü who himself ordered that Zak'are be taken shackled. He heaped other false accusations upon him, ordered him killed, dismembered and thrown to the dogs" (KG p. 393).

VA notes that Zak'are, the sparapet of Georgia... "was falsely accused with delaying in going to court at the set time he was supposed to" (VA p. 153); Interestingly, SO says nothing about this rebellion, either. KC pp. 238-49, passim; Mur. pp. 110-21, passim.

Dealing with the rebellions of subject peoples and waging war against Muslim powers in the Near East were not the only military operations occupying Īl-Khānid generals. Beginning with 1261, the Caucasus became an occasional theater of warfare between Īl-Khānids and yet another Mongol state, that of the Golden Horde centered in the lower Volga with its capital at Sarai. The organizer of this state, Berke-Khān (1257-66) a devout Muslim, was outraged by the anti-Muslim policies of the shamanist Hūlegū and especially by his massacre of the Muslim population of Baghdad in 1258. Not only did Berke and his successors attempt to infringe on the uncertain boundary between his realm and Hūlegū's (i.e., the Caucasus), but they also entered into an alliance with the increasingly powerful Mamlūk state in Egypt¹. The latter were the most ferocious enemies of the Īl-Khānids in the Near East, and the only power to have dealt the Mongols a severe military defeat there in 1260².

1 Spuler pp. 21-25; 27-29; SMP pp. 352-54; CIA v. 3 p. 218 foldout; KG pp. 395-96; VA's account on p. 153 is merely a chronological list derived from KG; SO p. 161; KC pp. 249-54; Mur. pp. 121-25.

2 Spuler p.20; SMP pp. 351-52; Het'um p. 53.

During the reign of Hülegü's son and successor Abaqa (1265-82) more examples of centrifugation among the Mongols became manifest. In the very first year of his rule, Abaqa was obliged to deal with another invasion of the Caucasus from Berke¹. With the latter's death in Tiflis in 1266, the troops of the Golden Horde retreated².

1

Spuler p. 26; KG's text ends with an incomplete description of this invasion, p. 399; VA chp. 98: "Now at the beginning of 1266/67, the governor of the North named Berke (Bark'a) who had held the position of Batu and Sartakh and was a Muslim, heard about the death of great Hülegü and he came with a multitude [of troops] to the Kur river to display his forces to the troops on this side of the river--troops of Abaqa and his brother Ismud, to show that he was alive after the death of their father. And Berke came and trampled them with little care, as far as Hečn. All the Muslims there prayed in joy. But those [people] on this side were terrified by this and walled off the length of the river called Sibar and kept in all readiness throughout the winter. Then Berke, having lost hope, returned to his place. And in the summertime he died. They say that in behavior he was not an agitator, and that he loathed blood-letting" (VA p. 162).

2

KC: "During this period the great Khan Berke came forth on the Darband highway to avenge [the deaths of] Xut'ar, Balal-, and Lul. Learning of this, Abaqa-Khan summoned his army and king David, and set out. But when he realized the size of Berke's army and its might, he did not cross the Kur, but went up the banks, leaving troops where the Kur and the Arax join, from there to Mc'xet'a. Berke ravaged the Shirvan country, Heret'i, Kaxet'i, and the whole bank of the Iori. The army came as far as Tiflis. Countless Christians were killed, while Berke-Khan encamped in the Garej mountains. Then God pitied the land and Abaqa-Khan. Berke was seized with some sort of illness and he died. Now his troops when they saw their Khan's decease, picked up the corpse and passed through the Darband Gates. So the land was pacified" (KC pp. 254-55; Mur. p. 126). SMP p. 356.

No sooner had this situation been resolved, however than one of Chingiz-Khān's great grandsons, Tegüder, rebelled in 1268. Tegüder's holdings included parts of southern Georgia and the Gelarkunik' area around Lake Sewan in Armenia¹. Armeno-Georgian troops aided in the suppression of this rebellion, just as they had fought for the Īl-Khāns against Berke². In both instances the Armenian and Georgian agriculturalists were the primary losers, since

1 HAP III p. 632; SEPHA pp. 161-62; SMP p. 357; According to the KC, in the period prior to the death of king David (d.1270), Tegüder, brother of Baraq-Khan of Turan, rebelled against Abaqa. The latter had granted Tegüder summer camping grounds on the Ararat mountains, wintering quarters on the bank of the Arax plus Naxijewan, and tax-collecting rights over the country belonging to Baraq there. Tegüder and his brother unsuccessfully plotted to overthrow Abaqa. When the plot failed, Tegüder went to Savseti and Ačaria in Georgia and persuaded the lord Sargis Jaželi to allow him to pass through. Meanwhile Abaqa sent a force including Sahnšah's son Iwane the mandat'urt'-uxuc'es and under the command of Chormaghun's son Shiremün, in pursuit. Tegüder was defeated and lost many men in a landslide. However he and the survivors managed to reach David in Kutais where he was royally entertained. "Frequently king David went to Tegüder and managed all the rituals and ceremonies, and so served before him....The same was done by the queen, the daughter of the great Palaeologus, ruler of Constantinople" (KC pp. 261-62; Mur. p. 133). Now as soon as Shiremün returned to Abaqa with the good news that Tegüder was out of the way, a road-guard on the Khorasan highway arrived saying that Baraq was on the move. Abaqa summoned David and the Georgian army and they went, with the Georgians serving as advance-attackers. While this was going on, Tegüder sent three commanders to raid Javaxet'i. Tegüder then ravaged K'art'li (KC pp. 265-66; Mur. pp. 135-37).

2

HAP III p. 632; Allen p. 117; GA ch. XVI pp. 375-77.

their particular districts were expected to feed and accomodate one or another party of Mongols, yet as a consequence of this were ravaged by the mutually inimical Mongol armies as punishment for aiding enemies.

The situation outlined above continued more or less unchanged until the reign of Ghazan-Khān (1295-1304). For the rest of Abaqa's reign and during those of his successors Aḥmad, Arghun, and Geikhatu, we see Armeno--Georgian forces fighting and suffering defeat from the Mamlūks (1281)¹; fighting the next year in the Far East against yet another Mongol state ruled by the descendants of Chingiz' grandson Chaghatai²; and fighting the armies of the Golden Horde, which in 1287 once again attempted to invade Caucasia³. In this period other woes befell the Armenians, both peasant and noble. As a result of the strengthening of the Muslim Mamlūks in Egypt, Islamic Turkic elements in Asia Minor began to take heart, to form secret alliances with their co-religionists against the Mongols, and to loot and pillage whenever they thought they could succeed. The brunt of Turkmen violence was the

¹ HAP III p. 634; SMP p. 363.

² Ibid. KC p. 284; Mur. p. 152.

³ SMP pp. 370-71.

sedentary Christian population, especially the Armenians, who had distinguished themselves as Mongol supporters¹.

1

Het'um pp. 56-59; Abu'l-Fida (Nalb. p. 238); BH p. 454 describes the capture and robbery of a caravan of Christian merchants from Cilicia and Rum in 1276; "And at [this] time (1276) the captain of the host of the fortress of Zaid (Xarberd) whose name was Bishar, a wicked man and a shedder of blood, an old man, one hundred years old, made up his mind to flee to the Egyptians. For he had in his heart a hatred of Mar Sarkis the bishop of the Armenians in the city of Arzengan, who was a great man and who was honored by the king of the Huns (Mongols). He determined to kill him and then to go away. And, taking certain of his free men with him, he went to the country of Arzengan. He heard that the saint was in one of his monasteries preparing for Palm Sunday, and he lay in wait for him on the road. And when the holy man rose up on the second day [of the week] of the Sabbath of the Passion to go into the city, his son who was great and famous, was also with him. And he said unto the holy man, his father, 'Do thou go into the city, and I want to go and occupy myself in such and such a village, where they want to consecrate the church which they have built'. And his father gave him permission to go, and he was not to stay too long. And when they had separated from each other, three Turkish horsemen came and met the holy man, and they dismounted and went to kiss his hand. And they said unto him, 'An ambassador hath come and he asketh for thee and thy son also to read the varlikh (i.e., a Mongol patent or administrative order) which he hath with him'. And the holy man said, 'My son hath gone to such and such a village, but behold I will come'. And when they had journeyed on a little farther, there fell upon them about two hundred Turkish horsemen, and they killed the holy man and the thirty souls, elders, monks, and other slaves, who were with him. And they cut off his head, and they took it and went and seized that village and they surrounded the church (wherein was the son of the holy man) very carefully. And when they entered the church they could not find him because there was a heap [of grain] there, and he had hidden himself inside it. And when they wanted to depart, one of those accursed infidels said, 'Let us set fire to this heap first, and then we will go forth'. And having set fire to it the young man came forth only half alive. And the Turks said unto him, 'Where is your father?' And he replied, 'He has gone into the city'. Then they cast down before him his [father's] head. And when he saw [it] he shrieked and fell down on the head of his father. And then and there, as he fell down, they hacked him limb from limb. And after these things that wicked old man Bishar took his

sons and all his company of soldiers and departed to the lord of Egypt" (BH pp. 455-56). See also SA p. 162. According to BH, in the late 13th century, bands of Turkmens, Mongols and Kurds were quite active in western Armenia and northern Syria to Cilicia. In 1282 nomadic Turkish bands were raiding around Xarberd (p. 465); 1285 raiding Arbil (p. 475); 1288 Mongols and Kurds were warring near Mosul (p. 477); 1289 marauding around Melitene/Malatya (p. 483-84); in 1290 Mongols despoiled Kurdish farmers in Diyarbakr (p. 485); in 1291 Geikhatu went against the Turkmens of Rum (p. 492), but in 1295 the Mongols and Turkmens were still warring (p. 508):

Throughout the 13th century the Saljuqid state was constantly being undermined by uncontrollable Turkmen warriors, who in fact, eventually brought that state down. The sources note Turkmen rebellions/rampages in 1239-40, 1261-62, 1276, 1277, 1286, 1290 (see DMH pp. 134-35; PT pp. 279, 280, 282, 286-88, 291, 293, 295-97. C. Cahen has observed that the Turkmens benefitted from the disorganization of cohesive societies (PT p. 299). Elsewhere, discussing the ethnic evolution of Asia Minor he wrote: "There has already been occasion more than once to mention in passing the new peoples which the Mongols' invasion had driven into Asia Minor, at first by thrusting them back before their own advance, later by carrying them along in their own ranks. Some were Iranians, others Turkmens, and there were even Mongols who were not solely garrison troops, but who settled down with their livestock and families in the eastern half of the country. In terms of numbers, there thus ensued an increase--which is impossible to calculate--in these ethnic groups as compared with the stable numbers of the natives; and there were also certain qualitative modifications. Leaving aside the Mongols, the new Turkmens were not the exact counterparts of the old ones, economically and culturally"...(PT p. 314).

"The Oghuz are not the only Turkish people to have supplied Asia Minor with settlers. Among the Turkish tribes some of whose members settled down there with the Mongols, there were some who derived from other Turkish peoples, such as the Uighur. There can and indeed must have been an absorption of the Cumans/Qipchaqs whom Theodore Lascaris had installed on the southern frontiers of the State of Nicaea for the express purpose of resisting the Turkmens. Moreover, the Mongols, who at the start were an undifferentiated army of occupation, as their Empire disintegrated, themselves seem to have become divided and reorganized into groups of tribes. Some of these were named as being still in Anatolia at the end of the 14th century in the histories of the gadi Burhan al-Din or of the Karamanids sometimes being associated with the Turkmens, sometimes hostile to them, in eastern and central Anatolia, and emancipated from the princes even when the latter were Mongols. Finally, many Kurds had been displaced. The distribution of the tribes found in Diyarbakr in the 14th

Ironically, in the late 13th century the Caucasian naxarar/didebuls too were punished--not by Turks--but by their own Mongol overlords. This must be explained by the very nearness of many lords to the Īl-Khān court and their great intimacy with its members. Thus in 1289, when Arghun-Khān crushed a plot against him organized by the emir Buqa, he also executed king Demetre of Georgia who had married Buqa's daughter and was, rightly or wrongly, implicated¹. Similarly, when Geikhatu succeeded his brother Arghun as Khān in 1291, he in turn killed off Arghun's prominent supporters, among whom were many Armenians².

The reign of Ghazan-Khān (1295-1304) is regarded by Mongol scholars as a watershed, during which important changes took place. Some changes, such as the Islamization of the Mongols, were of a permanent nature. Others, such as fiscal reforms, were ephemeral and did not take root among Ghazan's successors.

century was no longer the same as had been known hitherto, and was already as known in the 16th century. Moreover, it will be remembered, the Kurds penetrated into Armenian regions where they had never previously been recorded" (PT p. 316).

1

BH p. 481; SO pp. 176-77; KC pp. 286-92; Mur. pp. 154-59.

2

HAP III p. 636. Arghun, of course, had done the same: SO p. 172. For the end of the 1290's (c. 1296) both Orbelean and the KC speak of depredations caused by Mongol rebels (SO pp. 217-20; KC pp. 297-300; Mur. pp. 163-65).

It is a known fact that at the time of the Mongol conquests in the early 13th century the Mongols were characterized by their religious tolerance, or perhaps, indifference. They themselves were for the most part shamanists, although some prominent families among them were Nestorian Christians, having received the faith from Syrian missionaries to Central Asia¹. Consequently, throughout the 13th century, certain individual Mongol leaders exerted themselves to further certain Christian lords (both clerical and secular) subject to them. The Khāns themselves adroitly manipulated the anti-Muslim sentiments of their Christian subjects for their own military and foreign policy objectives². This situation changed with the Islamization first of Aḥmad-Khān (1282-84), and then, irrevocably, with Ghazan's conversion. Christianity quickly passed from the status of a favored religion to that of a tolerated religion. Anti-Christian persecutions began almost at once, and though checked during part of Ghazan's reign, they became the rule rather than the exception under his intolerant successors³. Now that the

¹ E.A. Wallis Budge, The Monks of Kublai Khan (London, 1928), Introduction; A.C. Moule, Christians in China before 1550 (New York, 1930); J.J. Saunders' article, "The Decline and Fall of Christianity in Medieval Asia", Journal of Religious History #2 (1968) pp. 93-104; See SMP ch. 7, A. Bausani, "Religion under the Mongols", pp. 538-49.

² SMP pp. 370-71.

³ SMP pp. 379-80, 542. During the first part of Ghazan's reign, persecution was severe (SA p. 164). King Het'um of Cilician Armenia was able to calm Ghazan's wrath

insatiable appetite for plunder of the Mongol nomad warriors could not be assuaged in successful wars against foreign enemies, it could at least be unleashed upon a new class of domestic enemies--the Christians. In Caucasia the "instrument of the anti-Christ" was a Persian Muslim named Nauruz, whose fanaticism seems to have been as much for the amassing of a personal fortune as for the promulgation of Islam

temporarily, according to BH p. 506. Anti-Christian persecutions had occurred prior to Ghazan's reign, in 1286 in Mosul (BH p. 482). See Armenian Neo-martyrs, bishop Grigor Karneci (d. 1321/22) pp. 121-22.

1
Step'annos has recorded that Nauruz received Ghazan's permission to extirpate Christianity: "Within our borders, they robbed the churches of Naxijewan, enslaved and tormented the priests; and they hauled off the doors of the chapels and demolished the altars. However, the great chieftains did not allow these churches to be pulled down which were respected by the Georgian troops. They also came to the great [religious] seat of Siwnik and wanted to pull down the church, but through bribes and violence we did not let them. They looted the monasteries in the district of Naxijewan, but the other Armenian lands on the other side of the Arax river were left alone, thank God" (SO p. 221). SO then describes how the Syrian Catholicos was tormented by the Mongols. King Het'um of Cilicia, enroute to Baidu was at the Syrian Catholicosate at the time. "They seized the bishop of Apostles' [church] lord Tirac'u and vilified him by various indignities, and took all of his things. As for his monastery which contained the sepulcher of the blessed apostle Thaddeus, they pulled down the structure, ruined, robbed, and totally destroyed it" (SO p. 221). King Het'um informed Baidu about the attacks, and he simply claimed that it was Nauruz' doing, that he was ignorant of the matter. A decree was promulgated permitting freedom of worship. Meanwhile the philo-Christian Kut'lu'sah married Baidu's daughter, and there was peace for Armenia. See also KC pp. 299-304; Mur. pp. 165-69.

His depredations in Georgia and Armenia provoked yet another rebellion which, like the two preceding ones, was crushed at the expense of extreme suffering to people, livestock, crops and property¹. Religious persecution intensified during the second part of the reign of Ghazan's successor, his brother Muhammad Khudā-Banda ("servant of God", 1304-16). In 1307 Khudā-Banda, or Karabanda ("servant of an ass") as the Armenian sources styled him, resumed collection of the jizya or head-tax on non-Muslims, something Ghazan had tried but was obliged to discontinue². The sources report that even month-old children were registered for payment of the jizya³. Furthermore, Christians were now required to wear identifying patches of blue or black material on their clothing⁴.

1 HAP III p. 637; Rashīd III p. 171; SO pp. 224-25.

2 SMP p. 533; HAP III pp. 640-41; 14CC #55 p. 41.

3 Ališan, Hayapatum, p. 526; 14CC p. 104.

4 SA p. 165 and BH p. 507 state that already in Ghazan's day this practise was adopted and included the Jews, who never had been a protected people under the Mongols. SA p. 168; 14CC #178 p. 138, #61 p. 46, #62 p. 47, #89 p. 66, #125 p. 92, #130 p. 96, #135 pp. 101-102. "...In this year [1318/19] the entire Christ-glorifying flock was troubled by the breath of Karabanda, Khan of the Nation of the Archers. Inspired by Satan, he ordered that taxes be collected from all Christians because of their faith in Christ, and he ordered that a blue mark/badge be sewn on the shoulders of Believers. Beyond this, they took taxes from clerics, without the Khan's order. Then the thrice-blessed, holy patriarch Zak'aria went after the Khan as far as Babylon [and remained] one whole year..He received from him a yarligh(alflex) freeing the clerics

Needless to say, such unenlightened policies did indeed create a new class of domestic enemies at a time when the Il-Khanid state could hardly afford it.

and priests from taxation, but they collected from the laymen and youths...And in the spring of this year they collected the tax, but in autumn the Khan died. Then there came Ailau, Sint'amur and Hasant'amur with 1,300 men, and collected the tax a second time, but without limit, and no one resisted them. The monks who were free, whom they captured, they tortured with unbelievable torments and collected limitless fines. The blessed congregation [of Varaga] fell into their hands. They arrived, suddenly, secretly, at night. Everyone fled, but those they seized they tortured so, that we are unable to relate it...Others who had fled did not dare return to the monastery for [the Mongols] kept coming, day and night troubling us. Horrified by them, in fear and trembling we spent morning and evening on the blessed mountain, in caves, and crevices of rock. But they came every day and opened all the church doors and small rooms and looted whatever they found... And we bore many other sorrows, harassments and trials from all sides, in summer and winter a fugitive, and sleeping out in the open on the blessed mountain...For a long time we bore these and other troubles, and for the love of the holy Cross, taking refuge in It, we did not leave this holy congregation. [People from] the city and country fled hither and thither, a silent meeting-place remained; but we stayed firmly in place out of love for the holy Cross" (14CC #178 p. 138).

Spuler writes: "On embracing Islam [the Mongols] became of one faith with the numerous Turks of Iran, who had long been solidly Muslim; and when the two peoples thus ceased to be kept apart by religion, they fused into a new amalgam, whose everyday tongue was Turkish. At the beginning of the 14th century, the various Turkish tribes which, together with later arrivals, have formed the backbone of the present Turkish-speaking element in the population of Persia, began to take definite shape. The province of Azarbaijan, which as the center of Il-Khanid power became the main focus of Turco-Mongol colonization, has remained solidly Turkish-speaking ever since, the Mongol speech having soon given way to the Turkish" (Spuler, p. 36).

Among the ephemeral changes instituted during Ghazan's reign was fiscal reform. This was undertaken on the prudent advice of Ghazan's chief vizier, the historian Rashid al-Dīn, a Jewish convert to Islam. Rashid attempted to check some of the most egregious abuses of the nomadic fiscal system, characterized by the repeated collection under force of imprecisely stipulated taxes; the billeting of hordes of official "emissaries" or elchis on local populations; and the wanton destruction of crop lands¹. But the early 14th century was already late for correcting abuses now over a century old, especially since the reforming spirit did not find favorable reception among Mongol nomad chieftains. Moreover, one should bear in mind that neither of the changes occurring in Ghazan's time-- Islamization as well as the beginning and end of fiscal reform --took place to the exclusion of those other features of Mongol nomadism outlined above. Far from it, religious persecution and economic chaos operated in addition to the other abuses. Thus, for example, in 1319 during the reign of Khudā-Banda's young son Abū Sa'īd (then a boy

1

On Ghazan's reforms see Spuler p. 37; SMP chp. 6 pp. 483-537, I.P. Petrushevsky, "The Socio-Economic Condition of Iran under the Il-Khans", especially pp. 494-500. For Armenia in particular, HAP III pp. 638-40; SEPHA pp. 273-82.

of 15), a Mongol chieftain named Qurumshi rebelled in the Caucasus. The Gelarkunik' area of Armenia and parts of southern Georgia were ravaged. The very next year another Mongol rebellion flared up, caused by a disgruntled basqaq or tax-collector. Northern Armenia and eastern Georgia were devastated¹. Īl-Khānid foreign policy too was on a disaster course, with the state's powerful neighbors, Mongols (Chaghatais, Golden Horde) and Egyptians arming for war². Meanwhile Armenians and Georgians still were expected to fight in the army to defend the Īl-Khānid state³.

1 HAP III p. 641; Colophons speak of religious persecution in Berkri (1318) 14CC #180 p. 144, Sebastia (1320) #202 p. 162, #284 p. 226; Lofi, #310 p. 249, Sebastia again #316 p. 256, and Karin (1335) #333 p. 270. Erzinjan was being harassed by Chobanids already in 1326/27 (SA p. 167). The city was besieged again in 1334 and again in 1336 (SA p. 168).

2 Spuler pp. 39-40.

3 See Ališan, Hayapatum, #353 p. 527 where prince K'urd II claims to have served militarily from 1292-1335. With the Islamization of the Mongols, references to Christian naxarars' service in the army disappear; See KC pp. 311-17, 319-24; Mur. pp. 175-81, 183-87.

Following the death of Abū Sa'īd in 1335, a period of nine years of internecine warfare broke out among various nomadic elements vying for power. Between 1335 and 1344 no less than 8 Khāns were enthroned, only to be deposed or murdered, shortly afterwards. But the collapse of the Īl-Khāns, far from signalling freedom from oppressive rule for the Armenians, meant only that that land now became the theater of warfare for the various new contenders¹.

During the first part of the 14th century, the first set of new contenders consisted of two nomadic clans, the Jalayirids and the Chobanids. The eponymous founders of both these clans had come to northwestern Iran, the Caucasus and Asia Minor during the 13th century. As a result of devastating battles fought between these clans in Armenia in 1338, the Chobanids emerged as temporary victors. The Chobanids, under the leadership of one Ḥasan-i Kūchak, reunited many parts of the fragmented Hūlegūid state (including Armenia)². However, their victory did not mean the disappearance of the rival Jalayirids. In 1340 Ḥasan-i Kūchak waged war against Jalayirid holdings in

1
SMP pp. 413-17; 14CC #339 p. 276, #347 p.281, #348 p. 283, #350 p. 285, #379 p. 306.

2
HAP IV (Erevan, 1972) ch . 1 pp. 15-23, L.A. Xačikyan, "Hayastane Čobanyanneri ev Jelairyanneri tirapetut'yan žamanakašrjanum [Armenia in the Period of the Domination of the Chobanids and Jalayirids]". HAP IV pp. 15-16; Sebastia/Sivas was starved into submission in 1339 (SA p.168).

Diyārbakr. The Muš area in southwestern Armenia was ravaged. In 1343 Ḥasan-i Kūchak raided parts of western Armenia under Jalayirid control, capturing Karin/Erzerum and Sebastia/Sīvās¹. In 1344 with Ḥasan's murder, real power passed to his brother Malik-Ashraf who ruled 13 years with ferocious cruelty. Not only did he battle Jalayirids, but he turned his wrath on the remnants of the once-great Armenian noble houses in Ani and Bjni in the north and northeast. These towns were ravaged in the early 1350's². The unwise and unpopular actions of the Chobanids estranged a sizeable portion of the nomadic aristocracy. To escape Malik-Ashraf's persecutions, many Mongol nobles fled westward from Iran to Armenian Naxijewan and to Caucasian Albania³. Flight, however, was not the limit of their response. Mongol nobles went

14CC #378 pp. 304-305.

1

HAP IV p.17; Erzicjan was beseiged and burned in 1339/40--1341/42 (SA p. 168); 14CC Erzicjan #400 p. 325, Sebastia #414 p. 334, Bayberd #433 p. 346, Vayoc⁴ Jor #448 p. 369, Divrigi #449 p. 369.

2

HAP IV p. 18; VT pp. 169-70; According to SA p. 169 in 1348/49 there was famine; scribes from Alt'amar report harassments in the early 1350's: 14CC #485 p. 405, #489 p. 408, at Erzicjan #493 p. 411; Alt'amar: #496 p. 414.

3

HAP IV p. 18.

north to Khān Janī-Beg of the Golden Horde, beseeching him to invade Āzarbāijān to "liberate" them. Thus in 1357 the Caucasus once more was overrun by invasion from the north. Janī-Beg put an end to the Chobanids that year, set up a new governor, and departed¹.

Now the Jalayirids became the new contenders for the Īl-Khān legacy. In 1358 Jalayirids fought the soldiers of Janī-Beg in Tabrīz, Naxiĵewan and Qarabāgh, expelling them and seizing much of the Chobanids' holdings in Armenia and Iran². However the Jalayirid state was nothing but an ever-shifting network of uneasy alliances among nomadic bands. Centrifugal pressures split it into numerous parts around 1374, after which nomadic tribes of Mongols, Turkmens and Kurds warred against one another and against the sedentary Armenian population³.

From the standpoint of destructiveness, two Turkmen groups played a major role in Armenia in the late 14th century. One was the Qara Qoyunlu ("Black Sheep") Turkmens who had established themselves in the central and southern Armenian districts in the late 13th century. Throughout the

¹ HAP IV pp. 19-20; Spuler pp. 40-41, 54-55; SA p. 169; 14CC #519 p. 433.

² HAP IV p. 20.

³ HAP IV p. 21; SA p. 170.

14th century they raided districts in southern Armenia and by the mid-1380's had extended their rule over parts of central Armenia¹. The other nomadic group was the Ottomans. The latter were a part of the Ghuzz tribesmen who had first come into Asia Minor in the 11th century, but greatly increased with new arrivals during the 13th century. By the beginning of the 14th century, the Ottoman entity had emerged as the strongest of the many small states to arise on the ruins of the Sultanate of Rūm. Throughout the 14th century the Ottomans continued to expand at the expense of other Turkmen principalities. Toward the end of the century, they controlled areas of western Armenia, such as Sebastia/Sīvās, Erzīnjan, and Melitene/Malatya².

The confused situation thus created in the Caucasus and in Asia Minor did not go unnoticed by Khān Tokhtamysh of the Golden Horde. In 1385, with an army of 50,000, he invaded Āzarbāījān via Darband and Shīrvān. After taking Tabrīz, his marauding army divided into sections, one group going via Mārand to Naxījewan and Siwnik', which latter district was plundered from south to north. Khān Tokhtamysh's divided army reunited in Qarabāgh and then

1
HAP IV p. 21; 1368 harassment of Christians in Muš 14CC #590 p. 483; 1370 Ekeleac' district, #601 p. 491; Ait'amar #607 p. 495; Kamax #681 p. 546.

2
HAP IV pp. 30-31; Mekk' 14CC #643 p. 520; Tarōn #652 p. 523.

returned north via Shīrvān. With them went 200,000 slaves including tens of thousands of Armenians from the districts of Parskahayk', Siwnik', and Arc'ax¹.

From 1220, when the Mongols first appeared in the Caucasus, to 1385 when Tokhtamysh invaded, a period of 165 years had elapsed. During this time different parts of Armenia had experienced no less than 12 foreign invasions, and the severity of Mongol rule had triggered three Armeno-Georgian rebellions. Mongol centrifugation had resulted in two major uprisings of Mongol nomads resident in the Caucasus itself. Moreover, with the collapse of the Īl-Khān state in the 1330's, a condition of "internal war" had existed in most parts of historical Armenia, as mutually antagonistic bands (and armies) of Mongol, Turkmen and Kurdish nomads fought one another and the sedentary native population. Religious persecution and economic chaos had long since become the norm. Armenia now lay supine. However, a new storm was about to break.

In 1386-87, 1394-96 and 1399-1403 Armenia was subjected to what were perhaps the most brutal invasions yet. These

¹ HAP IV pp. 22-23; SA p. 171; 14CC #700 pp. 559-60; TM pp. 12, 98.

were led or directed by the lame warlord Tīmūr (Tamerlane) and constituted the last invasions of Armenia from Central Asia. In his Mongols in History, J.J. Saunders wrote of Tīmūr:

...His career was a singularly barren one. The great Chingiz at least created an empire that imposed order and peace and a rudimentary civilization on Asia for over a century: Timur's kingdom vanished with his life, and his imperialism was imbued with no purpose other than the agglomeration of sheer power built on the corpses of millions. Till the advent of Hitler, Timur stood forth in history as the supreme example of soulless and unproductive militarism. n.l.

During the first Tīmūrid invasion of 1386-87, Naxiĵewan was captured and the fortress of Ernĵak was besieged (though it did not surrender until 1401). The towns and fortresses of Karbi, Bĵni, Gafni, Surmari and Koĵb fell, and the districts of Ayrarat and Lesser Siwnik' were devastated². Tiflis was taken and sacked, and Tīmūr had the opportunity to demonstrate his non-discriminatory policy vis-à-vis killing Muslims. Wherever he went, Christian and Muslim resistance received equal treatment:

¹ J.J. Saunders, op.cit., p. 59.

² The Continuator of Samuēl of Ani has the following entry under 1386/87: "The Turks took the fortress of Orotan and the great vardapet Kaxik went as a fugitive to Car... In the same year T'oxtamiš, Khan of Crimea dispatched troops to Persia. They came and entered Tabriz...they destroyed and captured more than 20 x 10,000 men and women, then crossed via Naxiĵewan and Siwnik', and went to their own land. In the same year Lankt'amur

either the resisters were exterminated, or entire populations were led off into Central Asia to live and die in slavery. After wintering in Mūghān Āzarbāijān, Tīmūr's generals crossed into the Kajberunik' and Čapaĵur districts of southern and southwestern Armenia, where they fought unsuccessfully against the Qara Qoyunlu Turkmens¹. Some Tīmūrid detachments reached as far north

came to Tabrīz and Naxiĵewan and thence in one day captured as far as Karbi and Bĵni, to Gafni, Surmari and Koĵb. Thence he went to Georgia and made holy war (ĵaza arar) against the city of Tiflis. Capturing the king Bagrat, he made him convert to Iĵlam (taĵkac'oyc'), then he went and wintered in Mughan. At the onset of the next year, on the day of Easter, he came to Siwnik' and spread all about. He went after the Turkmens as far as the Amida river, turned back on the city of Van, and besieged it for 25 days. He captured it on a Thursday...and threw everyone down from the fortress: 7,000 men. Then he went to the land of Samarkand. After six years, once again Timur came forth, descending into Baghdad where he killed many people and built six minarets out of heads. He went to Syrian Mesopotamia and killed many people there. Now the son of sultan Ahmad was in the fortress of Ernĵak. The Georgians came and took it. When Timur heard this he was angered and came forth in great rage. He went to Georgia causing much ruin and harm with sword, fire, and captive-taking. He demolished the grandest churches in Tiflis and thence descended to Syria. He approached Jerusalem but did not enter. Then he turned back with much booty and went to T'axt. The next year he went to Rum and took Kamax and many other places. In Sebastia he buried more than 2,000 people alive, then returned to his place. The next year he returned to Rum and captured khan Yeltrum who had countless cavalry and troops. He dispersed and captured all" (SA pp. 171-72). 14CC #709 pp. 567-68; Armenian Neo-martyrs, Vanak bishop of Bĵni (d. 1387/88) p. 136; HAP IV pp. 24-25.

1

HAP IV p. 26; "The commencement of copying this gospel occurred in the year 1387/66 (A.E. 836) in a bitter time when many places were devastated because of our sins. A wicked Mahmetakan tyrant named Lank-T'amur arose in the East with countless troops and enveloped Persia as far as the Rum country. Coming to Armenia he demolished and enslaved everything and pitilessly put to the sword all

as Karin/Erzerum, looting, pillaging, and taking slaves as they went¹. In 1387 Tīmūr beseiged the Kurdish emir Ezdin at Van. When he took the citadel after 26 days' beseigement, the women and children were enslaved, while some 7,000 males of all faiths were killed by being hurled from the walls². After Tīmūr left Asia Minor in 1387, severe famine ensued, since due to the disruptions he had caused, crops were not planted, and now there was nothing to harvest³. Cannibalism was reported in some areas⁴.

all the Armenians and Tačiks whom he found. Oh, who can relate all his eveil and the damage he occasioned in various places. Now...this was finished in the Kajberunik' country at the retreat called Manuk Surb Nšan, consecrated by the apostle Thaddeus, and at the foot of [the church of] Georg the General, during the patriarchate of Armenians of lord Zak'aria, when the country was controlled by Hara-Iwsiwf (Qara Yusuf), a wicked, bitter, loathsome wrecker of the land...May God not cause us to witness again what we have seen" (14CC #710 p. 569).

1 14CC #711 p. 570.

2 SA p. 171; 14CC #717 p. 573, #735 p. 590; 15CC A. pp. 286-87, 277-78; TM p. 30.

3 HAP IV p. 27.

4 TM p. 32.

The country hardly had recovered from this when, in 1394, Tīmūr returned. Entering western Armenia from northern Mesopotamia, he took Erziċjan, parts of Basen district and Awnik fortress; Kars, Surmari Koċb, Bagaran and Ayrarat were ravaged; and the Qara Qoyunlu Turkmen areas, centered at Arċeš, north of Lake Van, were attacked¹. At this point Tīmūr turned upon Khān Tokhtamysh of the Golden Horde who had been raiding Shīrvān. The Tīmūrids defeated Tokhtamysh and sacked his principal cities, Astrakhān and Sarai².

Tīmūr appointed Mīrān, his half-mad son, as governor of Iran, Iraq, Armenia and other parts of the Caucasus. In 1396 Mīrān continued operations against Ernċak in the south and expanded warfare against the Kurdish emir of Bitlis³. In 1397 southern Vaspurakan was ravaged and Ani in the north fell⁴. Strangely, all powers of resistance had not been completely broken by the Tīmūrids. In 1399 king Georgi VII of Georgia attacked the Tīmūrīd besiegers of Ernċak fortress, temporarily freeing those inside from the 13 year seige⁵.

¹ HAP IV p. 28; 14CC #756 p. 607, #762 p. 611, #765 p. 613, #772 p. 618.

² Spuler p. 67.

³ HAP IV p. 29.

⁴ 14CC #778 p. 621.

⁵ HAP IV p. 29 n. 43; Allen p. 124; 14CC #784 p. 629.

But when Tīmūr learned about the retaking of Ernĵak, he left Samarqand and headed for the Caucasus. In revenge he attacked northeastern Armenia and southern Georgia, killing, destroying, and taking slaves. More than 60,000 Caucasians were led into slavery this time (in 1400), and many districts of northern Armenia were depopulated¹. Subsequently, Tīmūr headed for western Armenia where he took Sebastia/Sīvās and Melitene/Malatya from his arch-enemies, the Ottomans². After conquering Aleppo, Damascus, Merdin, and Baghdad, Tīmūr decisively beat and captured the Ottoman sultan, Bāyazīd I in 1402. The next year Georgia was invaded again and its king finally submitted to Tīmūr. During 1403-1404 Tīmūr wintered in Qarabāgh before returning to Saraqand³. He died there in 1405 at the age of 70, having left a trail of blood and pyramids of decapitated heads across Asia and the Middle East.

¹ HAP IV p. 30.

² HAP IV p. 31.

³ HAP IV pp. 31-32.

Although the focus of this chapter has been on the invasions of the 13-14th centuries, the survey commenced with the Saljuq invasions of the 11th century and with the remark that they were a sort of "dress rehearsal" for the later invasions. In what ways were the invasions qualitatively similar and dissimilar vis-à-vis treatment of the Armenians? All of the invasions from the 11th through to the 14th centuries contained a Turkmen element which at times was "controllable" by the leaders of the invasions, but at times uncontrollable. This element worked to the detriment of settled societies (such as Armenia's) and to later Turco-Mongol governments as well.

The Saljuq invasions and conquest of Armenia occurred over a period of 50 years (ca. 1020-70). The initial Mongol invasions and conquest occurred over a shorter period, 1236-60. Both the Saljuq invasions and the 13th century Mongol invasions were facilitated by a weakened Armenia. In the 11th century, Armenia had been weakened by the policies of Byzantium. In the 13th century, the five year rule of Jalāl al-Dīn destroyed the Caucasian potential for resisting the Mongols. The Turco-Mongol invasions of the 14th century also encountered an Armenia weakened and exhausted--this time by the experience of Mongol domination.

Consequences of the Mongol domination regarding the Armenian lords are described in the following chapter. After the Saljuq invasions, those Armenian lords remaining in their patrimonies made accommodation with the new overlords and a process of "Armenization" or "naxararization" of the Saljuq nobility took place. This was possible primarily because from the late 11th until the 13th century no major comparable invasions or disruptions occurred. Furthermore, as was noted, the Saljuq domination was not uniform across the Armenian highlands. After merely forty years, the Saljuq empire was in pieces. Already in the early 12th century, thanks to Georgia, an Armenian center existed in the northeastern part of the highlands. By the 13th century many districts of historical northeastern, central and even southern Armenia were under Armenian political control again. Such was not the case from ca. 1221 to 1403 when the Armenian highlands were subjected to frequent invasions, having as it were, no time to recover from one before the next was in progress.

The Mongol domination lasted longer than the Saljuqid and incorporated Armenia into an empire more firmly. For almost 100 years (1240-1330) Armenia experienced Mongol rule and misrule. Nor was there a protector for Armenia. If in the 11-12th centuries Georgia was the deliverer and source of strength against Islam, in the 13th century the Armenians looked to the "Christian" Mongols--to the invaders themselves --for protection. With the Islamization of the Mongols, any

hope for protection, or even for equal, just treatment disappeared.

Finally, unlike the Iranizing Saljuqs of Asia Minor who created an era of economic prosperity in the 12th-early 13th centuries, the Mongols commenced their domination by looting many of the Armenian cities. Subsequently they literally taxed the life out of the various societies under their control--seemingly unaware of the ultimate consequences for themselves, as well as for the subjugated population.

CHAPTER THREE

ARMENIA'S LORDS AND THEIR REACTIONS TO THE
TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND DOMINATION OF
THE 13-14TH CENTURIES

This part of the study examines several aspects of the history of the lords or naxarars of Armenia in the 13-14th centuries: (1) who were the naxarars on the eve of the 13th century invasions (during the so-called Zak'arid revival) and where were their lands; (2) how did the naxarars react to the Turco-Mongol invasions/migrations of the 13th century; (3) how did the Mongols (both before and after Islamization) attempt to control the naxarars; and finally, (4) what were the reactions of the naxarars to Mongol policies?

Considerable debate exists among Armenists regarding many aspects of the history of Armenia's nobility. The derivation and thus the literal meaning of the term naxarar itself is debated¹. The genesis of the naxarars too has been depicted differently by the foremost investigators of the institution or phenomenon of naxararism, by Nicholas Adontz, Hagop Manandyan, and Cyril

1

On the various derivations see Adontz, Armenia in the Period of Justinian, published originally in Russian in 1908, translated into English with extensive editorial remarks and notes by N.G. Garsoian (Lisbon, 1970) p.514 n. 44; also Anahit Perixanyan's "Drevnearmianskiye vostoniki [The ostanik's in Ancient Armenia]", VDI #2 (1956) pp. 49-50.

Toumanoff¹. Most important, the essence of the term, its real rather than literal meaning has been perceived and described differently by these scholars². Adontz,

1

Nicholas Adontz placed the disintegration of clan relationships in the time of political unrest in Armenia under Zariadris and Artaxias (second century B.C.), and the completion of this process during the reign of Tigran the Great (first century B.C.) at which time the greatest naxarar families, in his view, already had emerged (Adontz, pp. 307, 310, 315). Manandyan challenged this, suggesting that "a significant break in clan relationships and the growth in power and authority of clan leaders and chiefs had already occurred in this ancient [Urartian] period" (Manandyan, Trade, also Feudalism, pp. 250-51). It is important to observe (see note 2 below) that Manandyan was looking for the "emergence of feudalistic features" in Armenian society, automatically equating this with naxararism or "naxarar customs"---which to my knowledge he nowhere defines. Toumanoff places the appearance of dynasts before the creation of the Urartian state, styling them the "immemorial dynasts", Studies, pp. 50-52, 69, 74, 79, 136, and note 2 below.

2

Adontz, pp. 303-26 viewed the naxarars as descendants of tribal chieftains of different ethnic backgrounds who held power by right of birth. Manandyan (to the extent that it was and is possible given the scanty information available) focussed on the class position of the naxarars relative to the other classes in Armenian society. He, as many Soviet scholars, was eager to associate the naxarar "system" with Western European feudalism (See Manandyan, Trade, pp. 70-72; Feudalism, pp. 42-89; also B. Harut'yunyan's article "Feod-in ev beneficium-in hamapatasxanoh terminnere hay minadaryan grakanut'van mel" [Terms Corresponding to Feod and Beneficium in Medieval Armenian Literature], Lraber #12 (1958) pp. 87--95, and the remarks of Sukiasian in the forward to his study on early "feudalism" in Armenia, Sukiasian pp. 15-27). Toumanoff, in his classic Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963) has reexamined the entire history of the Armenian highlands from Urartian times to the Bagratid period. Toumanoff considerably elaborated and took in new directions Adontz' recognition that the Armenian social system had a double aspect: one "feudal" and one dynastic (Studies, pp. 34-144, 154, 188). According to the author, the dynastic element pre-dated statehood (be it Urartian statehood, Arsacid or other) and consequently

Manandyan and Toumanoff likewise disagreed on the duration of the naxarar "system". Adontz wrote:

The naxarar system existed in Armenia from antiquity until the Mongol invasions. Like any institution developing in accordance with conditions of place and time, the naxarar system often changed in character and passed through several phases. ¹.

Manandyan hypothesized that the participation of the naxarars in the Mongols' many campaigns and the heavy taxes of the period combined to initiate the system's collapse². The final liquidation of the system in his view came after the mid-fourteenth century, when Armenia became a battleground for numerous nomadic Turkic groups, though Manandyan noted certain "survivals" of "naxarar customs" in the inaccessible mountain regions of Eastern Armenia and Qarabāgh³. Toumanoff wrote:

This social structure perished with the brutal Byzantine and Seljuq destruction of the Armenian polity in the eleventh century. Some vestiges of it, however, survived the catastrophe, both in Armenia and, through emigration, elsewhere. ⁴.

regarded itself as equal to the monarch. One should consult the notes and appendices to Adontz provided by N.Garscian, also the same author's recent "Prolegemena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia", HA (1976) pp. 177-234, and also R. Hewsen's important tripartite study on the Meliks of Eastern Armenia (see Bibliography) on which see the conclusions of this study.

¹ Adontz, p. 183.

² Manandyan, Feudalism, pp. 255-56.

³ ibid. p. 256.

⁴ Studies, p. 144n. 262.

It is not our purpose here (and in any case it is beyond our present competence) to write the complex and often-changing history of Armenia's nobility from pre-Christian times to the 14th century. However, to place in sharper focus what is to be understood by the term naxarar in the 13-14th centuries, we shall contrast briefly the classical Arsacid (4-5th century) naxarar with his Zak'arid successor.

The socio-economic essence underlying the concept of the term naxarar underwent numerous changes from the 5th through the 13th centuries. The naxarar of the Zak'arid restoration differed fundamentally from the Arsacid lord. The Arsacid naxarar was the ancestral lord of clan domains which he did not personally own, and therefore could not alienate by sale or other means. If the truly great naxarar associated with the Armenian monarch, it was on terms of equality. As they never allowed their "natural lords" to forget, some of the grand naxarars descended from clans as old as, or older than, the Arsacids. For this reason, when naxarars accepted positions at the Arsacid Court, the act was usually a recognition on the king's part of the naxarar's right by birth and position to the office. The naxarar-doms tended to be self-sufficient economies, and trade in that period was of an international transit type through naxarar domains, of importance to the naxarars only due to the toll and customs revenue they could derive

from it. Their principal wealth was land, and the labor of dependent peasants living on that land¹.

Quite different were the lords of the Zak'arid revival. The nobility of the early 13th century consisted of different elements. One substantial group included men of ambition and military talents from newly-arisen families, who were rewarded by their Zak'arid overlords with grants of land and/or the rights of administration (see below). Before and after receiving lands and villages, this category of 13th century lord derived much wealth from booty taken during military campaigns. Another element is referred to in the sources from the 12th century as mecatun, which means literally "of a great House". In fact, these were men of great financial wealth, who formed the upper class in the many Armenian cities which had recuperated from the Saljuq dislocations. These men too lacked antique pedigrees, and did not belong to the old naxarar families. Their wealth had been gained through trading and money-lending and, in contradistinction to the Arsacid lords who did not engage in trade, a substantial part of the mecatuns' assets were in cash. However, these merchants reinvested their capital in land, buying not only entire estates, but also shares of establishments (such as mills)². An

1

See Adontz, Armenia pp. 289-371, and Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 33-144.

2

HAP ch. 34, B.N.Afak'elyan, "Mecatunneri k'alak'avin vernaxavi jevavoruma[Formation of the Mecatun Urban Upper Stratum]" pp. 585-94.

inscription (1215) of one mecatun, Tigran, from the historically unknown family Honenc', on the wall of the church of St. Gregory in Ani, indicates the far-flung and multi-faceted nature of mecatun wealth¹. From the inscription of another mecatun, we learn that ca. 1242 a certain Umek purchased the church of Getik for "40,000 red [gold] ducats", a currency which clearly indicates that such merchants as Umek were participating in the lucrative international trade with Italian city-states².

The nobility of the Zak'arid period included descendants of the ancient dynastic families: Mamikonids, Bagratids, Arcrunids, Orbēleans, and others. In my opinion, by the 13th century these groups are probably best considered extended families rather than clans in the Arsacid sense. Nonetheless, dynasties as hoary as these (some of which by then were more than 13-centuries in duration) had a strong consciousness of their own past, which they knew from the ancient histories. Most likely these names commanded rather profound emotions among the Armenians, and their bearers probably possessed a certain status for sentimental reasons alone, not held by other segments of the nobility. Probable too is the existence within such families of certain ceremonies

¹ VT pp. 58-59; Manandyan, Trade, pp. 185-86.

² Manandyan, pp. 186-87.

rituals and regalia--especially within some of the Siwnik' and Iaçen dynasties--unshared by the merchants or Zak'arid warriors. Yet another segment of the Zak'arid nobility was composed of prominent clerics, representatives of various families, administering their family holdings as religious foundations (see below).

Nicholas Marr was of the opinion that in the immediately pre-Mongol and early Mongol periods the transfer of princely and noble estates into the hands of merchant-capitalists was taking place¹. This is probably true. However, the tendency for urban merchants to invest in land, and the probably concomitant tendency for the landed naxarars to diversify into trade makes any drawing of lines impossible. Indeed, the new meaning of the term hayrenik' in this period reflects the same confusion. In the 5th and subsequent centuries hayrenik' referred to a lord's ancestral patrimony. It consisted of lands. But in the early 13th century, hayrenik' referred to both moveable and immoveable property, hereditary or purchased, and included money and shares in business enterprises as well². Thus at the opening of the 13th century, the term naxarar had something of a catchall sense, exactly as the term melik did, two centuries later³.

1 Manandyan, Trade, p. 186.

2 HAP pp. 554-55.

3 R. Hewsen, "The Meliks of Eastern Armenia(I)", REA IX(1972) p.293

Unlike the territorial units of Arsacid Armenia studied by Adontz, which in some cases had been the possessions of different ethnic groups from time immemorial, the naxarardoms of the late 12th and 13th centuries were in many--though not all--cases the creations of the Zak'arid brothers, Zak'arē and Iwanē. The men chosen by the Zak'arids to administer and rule parts of northern and northeastern Armenia were not the elderly nahapets or the descendants of ancient tribal chieftains of Arsacid times who occupied office by right as much as by appointment. Rather, they were successful military commanders who had served under Zak'arē and Iwanē in the reclamation of Armenia from the Saljuqs. Many were men of ambition and action, lacking illustrious pedigrees. Frequently they were given charge of lands they themselves captured; often they were attached to the Zak'arids through marriage ties, as is illustrated below.

The properties under the overall jurisdiction of amirspasalar Zak'arē and later of his son Šahnšah were located in the northwestern parts of the reconquered lands: Lofi, Ani, Aragacotn, Bagrewand, Calkotn, Kogovit, Surmari, lands from the Virahayoc' mountains to the southern border of Calkotn, from Bolorpahakic' to Erewan. Ani was the center of this realm. Subject to Zak'arē's house were both newly-created families (such as the Vařuteans) and old naxarar families (such as the Pahlawunids,

Arcrunids, Mamikonids and others)¹. The first of these families was founded by one Vaçe, a loyal follower of Zak'arē but of an unknown background, who was given by his lord all the districts of Aragacotn, Sirak, Nig and Amberd as far as Eraxajor². He was made prince of princes of Zak'arē's realm. The Pahlawunids, ruling around Marmašen, Bagnayr and Lmbat, had acquired hereditary control over the office of bishop of Ani and Sirak, and occasionally were mayors of Ani³. The Arcrunids, who ruled the fortresses of Mahkanaberd and its environs north of Lake Sewan, were connected to the Zak'arids by marriage ties⁴. The Mamikonids held two small areas, one by Dseł, the other south of Gafni, around Urcajor⁵.

1 HAP chp. 32, I.H.Babayan, "Zak'aryannerin ent'aka feodalakan tnerē [Feudal Houses Subject to the Zak'arids]" p. 547.

2 ibid.

3 ibid. p. 548, also Appendix A.

4 See below p. and also Appendix A.

5 On the Mamikonids: H. Kurdian, "Mamikoneanneri Dseł ğule [The Dseł Branch of the Mamikoneans]", Bazmavep (1956) pp. 155-62, 246-51; also A. Sahinyan, "Mamikonvan-Hamazaspvan tohme Hayastanum XII-XIII darerum [The Mamikonean-Hamazaspvan Clan of Northern Armenia in the XII-XIII Centuries]" Iraber #3 (1968) pp. 84-93.

Under the jurisdiction of atabek Iwanē Zak'arean and later of his son Awag were the eastern areas: Bĭjni, Gelark'unik', Vayoc' Jor, most of Arc'ax, Siwnik', Naxijewan, Dwin, and Erewan. The center of this realm was first Dwin and later Bĭjni. Subject to Iwanē's house were the Orbēleans, Xalbakeans, Dop'eans and others¹. The Orbēleans, who originally had been the Zak'arids' overlords in Georgia were, in the changed situation of the late 12th and 13th centuries their subordinates in Armenia. Around 1184 atabek Iwanē Zak'arean under authorization from the Georgian Crown granted to the successful general Liparit Orbēlean lands in eastern Vayoc' Jor, Kotayk', Gelark'unik' and Kayean². Liparit married the daughter of the prince of princes of Siwnik' and became the founder of the Siwnik' Orbēlean line³. Another of Iwanē's subordinates was Vasak Xalbakean, originally from the Xaçen area, who had helped in the reconquest of Vayoc' Jor, Bĭjni, and Dwin. As a reward he was given lands in western Vayoc' Jor, Šahapunik', Varažnunik' and parts of Kotayk' and Ayrarat. This family came to be known as Pfošean after Vasak's energetic

1 HAP p. 548.

2 SO pp. 142-43.

3 SO p. 144. On the Orbēleans see also R.Hewsen, "The Meliks" REA #XI (1975/76 pp. 220-24.

son, Pfoš (1223-84)¹. Another small branch of the Zak'arids descended from Zak'arē's and Iwanē's first cousin (father's brother's son) also named Zak'arē, ruled lands in Tawuš, P'afisos and Gardman. The center of its realm was Gag fortress. This line became known as Vahramean after Zak'arē Gageli's son, Vahram of Gag².

A number of new and old naxarar families became associated with the Zak'arids through marriage alliances with three of Zak'arē's and Iwanē's sisters. Their sister Vaneni was married to Abas II Kiwrikan of Macnaber³; Dop'i married Hasan, prince of the old naxarardom of Arc'ax in eastern Armenia, receiving as dowry a large area on the southern shore of Lake Sewan and Sot'k' district in Siwnik'. Her descendants are known as the Dop'eank'⁴. Xorišah Zak'arean, another sister, was

1 G. Yovsēp'ean, Xaḷbakeank' kam Prošeank' (Antelias, 1969, repr. of 1928 ed. with additional collected articles) pp. 10, 14. Hereafter, X. On the Xaḷbakids, also R. Hewsen, "The Meliks"(III), REA XI(1975/76) pp. 225-26.

2 HAP ch . 32, L.H. Babayan, "Zak'aryan erek' iḡxanut'yunneri kazmayoruma [The Formation of the Three Zak'arid Princedoms]" p. 541.

3 On the Kiwrikanes: L.Movsēsean, "Histoire des rois Kurikian de Lori", P.Macler, trans. REA(1927) pp. 253-55, 266.

4 On the Dop'eans: G.E. Kirakosyan, "Matenagitakan telekut'yunner Dop'yanneri masin[Bibliographical information on the Dop'eans]" PBH #1 (1969) pp. 217-26; also R. Hewsen, "The Meliks"(II) REA X (1973/74) pp. 289-90.

married to Vart'ang lord of Xaçen district. The family was named after Hasan Jalal, the issue of this union. The Hasan Jalaleans ruled southern Xaçen¹.

In the early 13th century the Zak'arids had influence in southern Armenia too, though how much and how deeply it was felt cannot be ascertained clearly. As a result of his carelessness on a campaign against Xlat' in 1209/10, atabek Iwanē was captured by the Muslim lord of that city. Among the terms stipulated for Iwanē's release was the hand of his daughter T'amt'a. T'amt'a was married to Melik Ashraf of Xlat', and became the real ruler of parts of the Shāh-Armen state during periods of dislocation, from 1212 to 1231². Another Armenian "state" existed in the Van area, centered mostly at Alt'amar, but probably possessing property in the numerous Armenian cities under its spiritual jurisdiction, i.e., in the cities surrounding Lake Van: Berkri, Arčēš, Arcke, Xlat', Hizan, etc. This was the religio-political entity known as the kat'olikosate (or anti-kat'olikosate) of Alt'amar, a creation of the Arcrunids³. This surrogate state existed in addition to

1 I.A.Orbeli, h'Asan Dzhahalal kniaz' Khachenskii [Hasan Jalal, Prince of Xaçen] Izvestiia Imp.AN (St. Petersburg, 1909); also R.Hewsen, "The Meliks" (II) pp. 288-89.

2 See ch. 2 p.

3 When in 1021 king Senek'erim Arcruni of Vaspurakan exchanged his lands for lands in Byzantine Cappadocia, "he

an Arcrunid-Mamikonid mountain naxarardom in Sasun, to the west. Furthermore, the brothers Zak'arē and Iwanē (and also T'amt'a) were themselves of Arcrunid background. Their mother was Sahakduxt, daughter of Sadun I Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli¹. The existence of such families, whose properties and political-spiritual-financial jurisdiction embraced large parts of the Armenian highlands on the one hand must have presented unique opportunities for trade and more intimate ties. On the other hand, it provided unlimited opportunities for intra-family and inter-family conflicts².

did not give [emperor] Basil the monasteries, so that they would remain free and pray for Senek'erim and his son. There were 115, or some say 900 monasteries" (SA p. 104). An Arcrunid counter-kat'olikosate was established at Ait'amar in the early 12th century, and existed until the 20th century, much to the chagrin of Sis and Ejmiacin, other centers of the Church of Armenia. See N. Akinean, "Ait'amaray kat'olikosac' gawazanagirk'e" [The Succession of the Kat'olikoi of Ait'amar] HA (1916) p. 145, 148. Curiously, Akinean omits reference to the passage in SA.

1

X p. 7.

2

See Appendices A and B.

The Naxarars and the Invasions of the Early 13th Century

Of the various Turco-Mongol invasions occurring in the 1220's and 1230's, the most destructive were those undertaken by Jalāl al-Dīn Mangūbirdī of Khwarazm and by the Mongols. How did the naxarars react to them, and how did the new conquerors of Armenia deal with the naxarars? According to Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Step'annos Orbēlean and the History of K'art'li, the Armeno-Georgian army commanded by atabek Iwanē outnumbered Jalāl al-Dīn's force. But naxarar squabbles and jealousies appear to have been an important cause of defeat. Some sources politely and piously speak of divine intervention which managed to change the shouted command "charge" into "flee"¹. In fact, because of enmity between the atabek Iwanē and his relations Iwanē and Šalva (Vahram Gageli's first cousin), the atabek Iwanē refused to participate or to allow those troops under him to fight. Other detachments under lesser commanders fled or fought chaotically². Following their desertion, the prominent naxarars withdrew to the security of their inaccessible fortresses³.

1 SO p. 145.

2 See ch . 2 pp. 81-82 n. 2.

3 KC p. 180; Mur. p. 68: "...Now the mandat'urt'-uxuc'es Šahnsah was in Ani, the amirspasalar Awag was in Bjni, while Vahram Gageli, the people of Heret'i, Kaxet'i, Somxit'i, K'art'li, Toreli, Shavshet'i, Klarjet'i and Tao were all fortified into their keeps, each of them loyal to Rusudan's rule, but due to their preoccupation, they were unable to participate in the ceremony for king David".

Jalāl al-Dīn's destructive activities in Armenia and Georgia hardly can be considered a strategy to win popular support. Jalāl himself was a desperate fugitive from the Mongols. He did, however, entertain hopes of creating a state in his conquered areas, and, as Kirakos noted, he did establish an administration of sorts in Ganjak¹. In those areas where Muslim enclaves lived surrounded by Christian majorities--Tiflis, for example-- he was able to rely on Muslims as a base of support. Kirakos and the History of K'art'li both state that Jalāl was able to capture Tiflis with the complicity of resident Persians who opened the city gates and regarded him as their liberator². However areas ruled by Muslims regarded him and his uncontrollable Turkmen warriors as a danger, and allied to fight him³. Jalāl al-Dīn was not unaware of the Caucasian nobility. According to Kirakos, when he captured Xlat' on the northeastern shore of Lake Van, he married that city's figurehead ruler, Iwanē's daughter T'amt'a Zak'arean⁴. According to the History of K'art'li, Jalāl also hoped to marry the queen of Georgia, Rusudan, and even urged Awag to serve as match-maker, but Rusudan

¹ KG pp. 226-27.

² KG p. 226; KC pp. 175-77; Mur. pp. 64-65.

³ KC p. 182; Mur. pp. 69-70.

⁴ KG p. 228.

was unwilling¹.

The Armenian and Georgian sources tend to combine into one account events from the first and second Mongol invasions, of 1220/21 and of 1236. Naxarar reaction seemingly was quite similar on both occasions, and almost identical with the reaction to Jalāl al-Dīn. Some of the Armeno-Georgian forces fought, while others deserted and took refuge in their strongholds. Dissension and rivalries among the resisting troops are reported by the sources². Despite the numerical superiority of the Armeno-Georgian army, the Mongols were disciplined fighters. Their adversaries were not.

¹ KC pp. 173-74; Mur. pp. 63-64.

² GA pp. 292,294: "...When the news of the coming of the Tat'ars was learned, Iwane took the cavalry of the Georgian kingdom and came to Gag, to the great and wise prince Varham [Gageli], son of Plu Zak'are. Taking him with his own army, he went against the Tat'ars. The mighty and great prince Varham took the right wing and Iwane the left ...When the battle was joined, through the influence of Satan, the enemy of Truth, Hamidawla, the lord of Manasa stable, because of some grudge, hamstrung the horse of At'abak Iwane. When the Nation of the Archers saw such dissension amongst them, they grew stronger and attacked the Georgian cavalry, mercilessly killing them".

Whatever the true sequence of events, by 1236, when the Mongols attacked the Caucasus a second time, bringing along sophisticated Chinese siege machinery¹, the Caucasian nobles had no intention of joint military resistance. Kirakos wrote:

...And since [the nobles] were unable to withstand that great blizzard [of Mongols] which had come, they all betook themselves to fortresses wherever they were able. The Mongols spread throughout the plains, mountains, and valleys like a multitude of locusts or like torrential rains pouring down on the land. 2.

The queen of Georgia and Vahram of Gag fled to northwestern Georgia; Šahnšah fled to Ačaria; and Awag secured himself into fort Kayean³. Not only did the naxarars not fight,

1
KG pp. 236, 241, 250.

2
KG pp. 238-39: "EW oč ēin karol zdēm unel anhnarin bk'ovn ekeloy, yas n avsořik aninapah elen amenek ean zayt aktealk' vamroc šah' šreša hāstac, iērañc' ew yoroc, sp' tealk' at hasarak šah' ibrew zanjrew yordut eamb teleal i veray erkri".

3
KC p. 187; Mur. p. 73.

but at least in one instance, the population of a city (Sank'or) belonging to Vahram of Gag, was forbidden to resist, by Vahram himself¹.

1

KG p.241-2:"One of the nobles, named Molar novin, whose lot had fallen over those regions, while they moved from their abode in the Mughan plain, sent a small force of about 100 men who came and encamped by the city of Sank'or, and blocked the entrance to and exit from it". This city belonged to Vahram and his son Aibula who had taken it from the Persians. When the residents sent to Vahram for protection the latter refused and forbade them to resist. "The foreigners' army increased daily until their commander Molar arrived and fought against the city. He filled the trench which surrounded the city walls with wood and stalks, so that they might easily climb onto the walls. But the people threw fire down at night and burned the filler. Now in the morning when Molar novin saw that, he ordered each of his soldiers to bring a load of soil and to throw it into the trench. When this was done the area became level with the walls.

"Then each soldier applied himself to that part of the city directly in front of him. And they took it, killed all the inhabitants, burned the buildings and took whatever they found there. They then fell upon other fortresses under Vahram's sway: Terunakan, Ergevank, Macnaberd (which belong to Kiwrike Bagratuni, Aisartan's son), Gardman, and other regions [such as] Çarenk'. And another chief named Latalan novin went to Getabak. Now Vahram who was then in Gardman, secretly fled at night to wherever he was able. Meanwhile the army of foreigners battled with the fortresses. Those inside them unwillingly provided the Mongols with horses, livestock and whatever else they demanded. The Mongols placed taxes over them and left them...

"But those who took Sank'or had come with all their baggage to Tawuş, Kacaret', Norberd, Gag and the surrounding areas. Placing these regions in great straits, they besieged them" (KG p. 242). See also KC pp. 186-87; Mur. pp. 72-73.

The common danger posed by the Mongols proved insufficient to unite the naxarars. The History of K'art'li describes the situation obtaining in Christian Caucasia on the eve of the princes' surrender:

When the country was subjected to such bitterness and wicked acts, the powerful erist'avs of erist'avs and the veziers rose up against each other and became each other's murderers. For queen Rusudan was entirely settled on the far side of the Lixt mountains and was unable to cross to this side of Lixt; nor were the veziers on this side able to go to her, having no chance. They became wanderers. So they were disunited and imprudent. Thus Georgia's powerful and renowned ones became unable to fight the Tatars to save themselves. 1.

When the naxarars realized the futility of resistance they began surrendering. The Mongols richly rewarded those submitting--an inducement to the hesitant--while simultaneously devastating the lands of recalcitrant lords. They demanded taxes, appointed guards for key areas, demolished the walls encircling fortresses which they considered potential bases of local resistance², and required the naxarars and their troops to participate in the subjugation of other areas. Frequently they obliged the Caucasians to fight as advance-attackers, to prevent their desertion³.

1 KC pp. 188-89; Mur. p. 74.

2 KG pp. 237, 241, 313; GA p. 297.

3 The Armenian and Georgian princes' submission to the

Mongols is recounted variously by the different sources. KG's account begins in chp. 26, "Concerning Prince Awag's Fall into the Hands of the Tatars". Awag, at the time was holed up in Kayean fortress where he, and many inhabitants of the district had sought refuge. "The land filled with the troops of foreigners...They settled around all sides of the wall at the base of the fortress and sent messages to Awag to come out to them obediently in service and not to be afraid. Many times they sent to him saying the same thing. Now Awag, desiring to win their approval, gave over to the Tatars his daughter and many goods, so that perhaps they would lift the siege. But they took his gifts and still more insistently demanded his presence". The besieged suffered from thirst. "So they gave over to the Tatars their horses and all their livestock, so that they allow some of them to go and bring water for their animals. Undertaking their plan in a body of many men, they went to the water source there. The Tatars blocked their path to the water. They killed no one, but told them to lower down their families and to live among them. Unwillingly and in grief, they brought down their families. They drank water and were kept among the Tatars. The Tatars took the women they wanted and killed their men, leaving others without their husbands.

"As soon as Awag saw that the Tatars did not let off besieging or destroying them, he wished to surrender so that perhaps things would be lighter for the people. So he sent Grigor called Tlay ['lad'] with flatteries. He was one of the Xaŕen azats, the superintendent of Awag's home. [Grigor] was sent in advance of Awag, to go and meet with their leader Chormaghun who had pitched his tent by the shores of lake Geŕark unik [Sewan]. When the great noyin Chormaghun heard this, he was delighted and sent immediately to Itulata, who was besieging Kayean, to speedily come to him and no longer harry the inhabitants of the fortress and district. Itulata took Awag and quickly came to Chormaghun. When Chormaghun saw the prince, he said to him: 'Are you Awag'? The prince replied: 'I am he'. The great commander then asked: 'Why did you not come quickly to me when I entered the boundaries of your land'? The prince responded: 'While you were far away, and my father was living, he served you with many gifts (pataragok). As soon as my father died, I served you according to my capability. And now that you have come to my land, lo, I have come before you. Do with me what you will'. [To my knowledge no explanation has as yet been offered for this curious passage-RB]...[Chormaghun] further ordered all of his troops not to fight with the fortresses and cities under Awag's domination. And great ease came about in his land and many captives among the azats were freed because of him. And Chormaghun gave him all of his land and more besides and established unbreakable friendship with him. Taking Awag and all his troops, Chormaghun marched against the city of Ani" (KG pp. 255-57).

Awag then visited the Khān in Qara Qorum. "When he came back to his land and the commanders implemented the orders of their king, the following men came to the Tatars in service: Sahnsah, son of Zak'are; prince Vahram and his son Albuqa; Hasan called Jalal, prince of the Xaçen area, and many others. The Tatars gave to each one control over his lands and for the time being, a pardon" (KG p. 263).

In ch. 30, Kirakos describes the conquest of Xaçen, where many people fled to the inaccessible fortress called Hawaxalac ("Perch"). This fortress was taken and its people killed. The Mongols also went against prince Hasan Jalal, the son of the sister of Zak'are and Iwanē, who holed up with the population under him in the fortress "which is called Xoxanaberd in Persian. When the Tatars arrived to seize the fortress, they saw that it was not possible to take it. So they called Jalal to them, amicably. And he wisely pleased them. Later, he himself went to them with many presents. The Tatars honored him and gave him back his land and other lands besides, and ordered him to come to them each year for war service, and ingenuously to be obedient to them" (KG p. 269).

According to VA, following the taking of Samk'or by the Mongols, Vahram of Gag and his son Albuqa fled from place to place "until they learned that the Tatars spared those people who voluntarily subordinated themselves to them. Then they [Vahram and his son] went and received back from the Tatars those castles and districts they had captured, which were their sep'akan patrimony (hayrenik'). All of them were taken: Tawus, Kacaret', Terunakan, Ergevank', Macnaberd which was [the property] of Asxart'an Kiwrikan, Norberd, [the property] of the royal (tágaworazn) Vasak; and the impregnable fortress K'awazin; the renowned fortress of Gag and the district built up by king Gagik... Everything was surrendered to them in a short period without toil or labor. For we knew that it was the Hand of the Lord, which, before our very eyes, had given over our land as food for the foreigners" (VA p. 145).

SO: "When the Tatars first came to this land, our districts fell the lot (bažin) of Aslan noyin. Elikum [Orbelean] was holed up with his people in the impregnable fortress of Hraškaberd. That Aslan came and circumlocuted the fortress and realized that it was humanly impossible to take it. So he encamped opposite the fortress and sent messages to Elikum, saying: 'Make friends with us; come to us, and you will find many benefits from us. Otherwise, no matter how long you sit on your rock, we shall not quit this land. For God has given us this [land] as patrimony, and when you come forth, it will be the ruin of you and your tun (House)'.

"When Elikum heard this, he did not reject the advice, but instead, replying sweetly, he requested an oath. And he went before [Aslan] with numerous gifts. When Aslan saw this, he liked Elikum greatly and received him and made peace" (SO p. 149).

GA: "Thereafter when the wise princes of Armenia and Georgia realized that God had given power and victory to [the Mongols] to take our lands, they then became reconciled, and became obedient to the Tatars and promised to give the taxes, i.e., the mal and t'alar, and to come out to them with their cavalry wherever they led them. The Tatars, agreeing to this, ceased their killing and destroying the land, and themselves returned to their place, the country of Mughan. But they left a chief named Lara Bula to demolish all the fortresses which they had taken. They destroyed to the foundations the impregnable fortresses built by the Tačiks at great cost. This all came to pass" (GA p. 297).

KC: "When atabek Iwane's son, the amirspasalar Awag saw these crimes, he sent emissaries to Partaw, where the above-mentioned noyins had encamped for the winter. The latter passed the summer in the mountains of Gełark'unik and Ayrarat, for at that time, Chormaghun had taken Ani. Awag sent to them emissaries, seeking reconciliation. He promised to go to see them, to serve and to pay taxes, for the preservation of his country; he demanded an oath and assurances. They were delighted and accepted Awag's emissary with affection and swore a firm oath.

"...When Awag's emissaries returned and relayed to him all that happened, spasalar Awag went to them, having staked his soul for his lands. He went to Chormaghun, Chaghatai, Baiju and Yusur, who saw and honored him, became intimately acquainted, and appointed guards for [his] cities. In their language these are called gan.

"Awag's land was thus pacified. When the mandat'urt -- uxuc'es Sahnšah was informed of the reconciliation between Awag and the Tatars, he too wanted to keep his country safely, in peace, and unharmed. He told Awag to notify them that he wanted to go to see the Tatars. The Tatars were informed and agreed to it with joy, and for this too they also swore the golden oath of assurance. Sahnšah also went and saw them. They similarly honored him greatly and returned to him Ani and the land of his they had taken, in its entirety. Then they appointed guards for the interior of the country. They received with honor all the Georgian princes who came [to them] while they ravaged the lands of the disobedient. When Zak'are's son, Vahram Gageli was informed of this, he too sought refuge [with the Tatars]. With reconciliation accepted, his lands too were pacified... However Heret'i and Kaxet'i, Somxit'i and K'art'li and above as far as the city of Karin (Erzerum) were undergoing bitter destruction... [The Mongols] enslaved and raided K'art'li, Samc'xe, Javaxet'i, and above as far as Greece (=Rum), Kaxet'i, and Heret'i as far as Darband.

"Forced to this fate by chastisements, all the princes of Georgia, the people of Her-Kaxet'i, of K'art'li, Toreli--Gamrkeli, Sargis T'mogveli an educated and virtuous man, sought refuge with the Tatars, while the Meschs, for the dignity of queen Rusudan did not submit". Chaghatai, enraged,

Indeed, it was during such Mongol campaigns--be they in the as yet unsubdued areas of eastern Armenia, or in those areas of western Armenia under Saljuqid rule--that the naxarars had the opportunity to display their martial prowess, their loyalty, and their greed. For there was much booty to be had, and this naturally appealed to the naxarars. Thus (in 1236) did the atabek Awag participate in the sack of Ani (the property of his cousin Šahnšah) and the looting of its churches¹. The city of Karin/Erzerum was sacked in 1242². The naxarars are reported to have been

invaded Samc'xe and devastated it. "When there was no strength left, Iwane C'ixisjvarel-Jaqeli, who was also called Ivarivare, appealed to queen Rusudan, at her agreement, for him also to seek protection with Chaghatai, to free the country from destruction. He [first bothered to ask her permission] because he was the mečurčlet-uxuc'es and the prince of Samc'xe. The queen agreed and sent him. Then Iwane went and met Chaghatai who received him with honor and appointed guards for the country" (KC pp. 189-91; Mur. pp. 74-76).

1
KG pp. 257-60.

2
KG p. 279: "...And at that time the city was heavily populated, being filled not only with Christians and Tačiks, but all the people from the entire district had assembled there. In the city were countless holy gospels [belonging to] the great and the lowly. The foreigners took them and sold the expensive ones to the Christians in their army, cheaply. In glee they spread through each district, dividing up the churches and monasteries". However, to the credit of the princes, KG notes "May Christ reward the Christian princes Awag, Šahnšah, Vahram's son, Aibula, pious Dop's son, Grigor Xaçenc'i, and their troops. For these princes bought out of slavery as many men, women, and children, bishops priests and deacons as was possible..." (KG p. 280). GA pp. 307, 309: "...Then the Armenian and Georgian princes took [away] many books, heortologia, martyrologia, the Apostolic works, lectionaries, Acts, and the Gospels written in gold, richly adorned beyond comparison for the edification and adornment of the sons of the new

enriched specifically after crushing the Saljuqid sultan of Rūm, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai Khusrau near Erzincan(1243/44)¹. Even when the sources do not specifically mention it, the naxarars, if not the common soldiers ordinarily received some share of the booty during the Mongol campaigns. Aknerc'i's account of the naxarars' behavior in the city of Mayyāfārikīn/Tigranakert (which was starved into submission) probably was typical of the naxarars' actions elsewhere in western Armenia².

Zion. Whence they took and brought them to the eastern country and filled the monasteries with all the adornments of the Church".

1

KC p. 194; Mur. p. 78: "The Georgians and Tatars swelled up with all sorts of treasures: gold and silver, gold and silver cups and bowls, extraordinary cloths and clothing and so many horses, asses and camels that it is impossible to count them".

2

GA pp. 334, 336: "...The Armenian troops there with the Tat'ars found many relics of the saints and took them to their land. Now the great prince of Armenia named T'aleadin, from the Bagratuni family, seized a Syrian presbyter and made him confess that he had found the right [hand] of the blessed apostle Bartholomew. With great joy [T'aleadin] took it to his eastern land and put it in his monastery. Afterwards, forced by the great Arcrunid prince named Sadun, he gave it to him. Sadun, lord of Haibat's great and renowned holy congregation had the blessed right hand of apostle Bartholomew placed in the holy congregation of Haibat. And it is in fact there".

Mongol Control Techniques in the 13th Century

The Mongols dealt with the Caucasian nobility in a number of time-honored ways: through the manipulation of naxarar precedence and the co-optation of allegiance; and through de-naxararization. Given the normal rivalries and antagonisms among the lords (see below, Appendix B), the manipulation of naxarar precedence was made quite simple. The Mongols, before conquering a particular region (such as the Caucasus) always divided up by lots among their generals the area to be taken¹. The naxarars, upon surrendering to them, became the clients of the particular Mongol general conquering that territory. The immediate effect of this was to distort and partially destroy the nexus of political (and of course, military) ties which had existed between the nobles and the Georgian Crown.

1

KG pp. 237-38; VA p. 144; SO p. 149. From Kirakos' narration it is clear that during the conquest of Armenia, the Mongols had a fairly clear understanding of the relative importance of prince Awag [KG p. 256]. Somewhat annoyed by Awag's slowness in submitting, the Mongol noyin Chormaghun showed his displeasure in an episode regarding seating precedence. See KG pp. 256-57.

In theory as well as in practice, the Mongols regarded all conquered lands as their own property. They did not hesitate to favor submissive princes or punish the recalcitrant by giving lands or taking them away. The Mongols were adroit at exploiting antagonisms existing within branches of the same family. Thus, when Awag (ca. 1243), harried by the Mongols' excessive demands, fled to the court of queen Rusudan (herself a fugitive from the Mongols), Kirakos noted that the Mongols gave his land to Šahnšah because of the latter's greater faithfulness¹. Another striking example of precedence manipulation within a single family concerns the Georgian royal Bagratids themselves. The Mongol commander Baiju furious with Rusudan for not surrendering to him, enthroned her co-opted son, David Rusudanean². Eventually sanctioning two monarchs, the Mongols effectively divided the kingdom and the royal treasury, expropriating one third of it for themselves³. But following Rusudan's death (ca. 1247) and before the enthronement of the two rulers, the Mongols again manipulated the precedence of the lords to suit their principal aim, namely of encouraging centrifugation. The History of K'art'li, after noting Georgia's rulerless condition, continues:

¹ KG p. 265.

² KG p. 289. Also see Appendix B.

³ KG p. 317.

Consequently, each one [prince] arranged matters individually and concerned himself with his own affairs. Each prince attached himself to a noyin and the Tatars appointed a Ten Thousander officer for them, whom they called dumnaget. Princes were chosen by them [the Mongols]. First was Egarslan Bakurc'ixeli, a very eloquent man, but not one with a respect-worthy behavior. They bestowed on him the army of Heret'i, Kaxet'i, and Kamcechovani above to Tiflis and to Mt. Samaxi. They entrusted to Sahnšah his own and Awag's properties; to Varham Gageli all of Somxit'i; to Grigor Surameli, K'art'li; to Torel-Gamrekeli, [still] a youth like Egarslan, Javaxet'i, Samc'xe, and above to the city of Karin; to C'otne Dadiani and the duke of Rač [Kaxaberi, father of Gonc'a Kaxaberije-Awagean], all of the kingdom on the other side. 1.

Prior to the return of Awag and the two Davids from a sojourn in the Far East, Egarslan Bakurc'ixeli's power was permitted to grow, until:

...he became so very powerful that he almost dared to be called king. The entire Georgian people was subject to his command, as to a king's including the great and honorable mandat'urt'--uxuc'es Sahnšah, Varham Gageli, and all the other princes. 2.

Upon Awag's return from the Far East, Egarslan was expelled from the country, as the Mongols looked on approvingly³. In the late 1250's, the Mongols attempted to elevate Sargis Jaqeli-C'ixisjvareli for saving Hülegü-Khān's life during battle. Their actions, and the reaction of the Georgian Crown show very well the divisiveness engendered by Mongol policy:

1 KC pp. 207-8; Mur. pp. 87-88.

2 KC p. 212; Mur. p. 90.

3 KC p. 225; Mur. p. 100.

...Now [the Khān] gave to king David and his soldiers great honor and numerous gifts, so much so that he granted by yarligh the city of Karin and the surrounding lands to Sargis Jaqeli.

At that time some foes envied [Sargis] and said to the king: 'Now why do you not give Sargis your kingdom, too, since the Khān has strengthened him so much that he will no longer be subject to your rule'. The king believed this, because he was untried and credulous of both good and evil words. At night he went to the noyin and explained: 'If the Khān gives Sargis the city of Karin, he also gives the kingdom'. Elgon noyin was astonished and replied: 'The Khān gave it [to him] because of his activity with you, but if it bothers you, he will not give it. In battle you Georgians do nothing good for the brave warriors. Don't you know that Sargis saved the Khān from the enemy, and offered a tough and noteworthy fight?'

The noyin went and informed the Khān of the entire conversation, and [as a result] he did not give the city of Karin. When Sargis heard about this he was stunned and grumbled against his lord. That winter the king was kept in Partaw while the disgruntled Sargis went to Samc'xe. 1.

In the 1260's and 1270's the Mongols furthered the territorial and political ambitions of the Orbēleans and the Arcrunid/Mahkanaberdelis, at the expense of the Zak'arids and Georgian Bagratids, but as is noted (Appendix B) the consistent contradictions in the sources obscure the picture somewhat. Finally, at the end of the 13th century

1

KC p. 250; Mur. p. 122. Subsequently king David imprisoned Sargis, but Abaqa-Khān ordered his release. The KC adds: "From this point on, the Jaqelis became loyal to Hūlegū" (KC p. 255; Mur. p. 127; also KC p. 297; Mur. p. 164).

and the beginning of the 14th, the Mongols elevated a Jaqeli to the throne¹.

Another method of manipulating naxarar precedence involved detaching certain prominent princes from economic and political connection with the Georgian Crown(s). The best known example of this involves the Armenian Orbēleans of Siwnik'. Smbat Orbēlean was granted injū status in 1252 on a trip to the Far East:

...[Mōngke-Khān] readily accepted these words [of counsel] and then entrusted Smbat to his mother named Suraxt'ambek, saying: 'This particular ark'ayun we shall keep for ourselves and not allow any other [person] authority over him'. And they styled him enču, that is, teruni. They ordered him to remain at court for some days and instructed the officials to provide him with a daily stipend from the court... Furthermore they removed Smbat['s name] from the dawt'ars of the Georgians and others. 2.

Another prince who apparently received injū status was Hasan Jalal. Around 1257, Hasan accompanied the new Khān of the North, Sartakh, on a trip to the Great Khān

1
KC p. 324; Mur. pp. 187-88.

2
SO pp. 155, 157: "Orum yovž hawaneal ew mtadiwrut'eamb enkaleal zbansn apa tay zSmbat morn iwroy ew yanine nma, orum anun Suraxt'ambek kočiw, ew ase. zays mi ark ayuns mez pahesc uk' ew oč tac uk' avl umek ičxel i veray dora. Ew anuanec in zna Enču, avsink'n teruni. ew hramayec' in kal i drann awurs inč. ew yanjec' in gorcakalac n tal or est ore yark unust' zročikn... Ew ehan zSmbat i durs yamenayn dawt' arac i Vrac ew yayloc'."

Möngke:

...With Sartakh was the pious prince of Xaçen, Jalal, who had gone to reveal to his supreme lord the diasters he had borne from governor Arghun, from whom he had barely escaped death, thanks to the Tačiks. And he gave him a document [entitling him] to rule his principedom independently, and to fear no one. For Sartakh liked Jalal on account of the prince's Christianity, since he too was Christian. 1.

Apparently, around 1273 Sargis Jaqeli also received injü status². During the same decade the cities of Kars, T'elavi, Belak'an "and many other lands" were separated from royal control and given by the Mongols to Sadun Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli³.

1

KG p. 373: "End nma er ew barepašt iškann Xaçenoy Jalaln, or ert eal er c'uc'anel zašets iwr teafnn tiezerac , zor kreac' na yAršun oštikanen, or haziw zercaw,i mahuanen i sadreloy tačkac n. Ew et nma gir iškaxnut ean iwroy tarel sep akanabar ew qš erknčel yumek'e, zi siser zna Sart axn vasn k ristoneut ean, zi ew na k ristoneay er".

2

KC pp. 270-71; Mur. pp. 140-41: "Then all the didebuls of Georgia assembled and took the royal Demitre to the Horde. They went to Sahnšah's son, Iwane, the mandat'urt'--uxuc'es, and he too went to the Horde where they saw to it that Demitre received the reign...[Abaqa] gave the entire kingdom to him, excepting the lands of Sargis Jaqeli. He sent him to Sadun whom king Demitre made atabek...[Speaking of the Pervane's replacement as ruler of Rum]: To him they entrusted the principedom of Rum, including Ačur and Samc'xe which had belonged to the Pervane from his [Georgian] wife's dowry, and they bestowed on him Sargis Jaqeli and his son Beka". See also KC p. 297; Mur. p. 164.

3

KC p. 272; Mur. p. 142.

Co-optation of allegiance, a corollary of the manipulation of naxarar precedence, occurred as a natural consequence of Mongol policies. This involved more than simply the extension of one lord's boundaries at the expense of another's. The Mongols attempted to incorporate certain prominent naxarars into their own court and administration, and thereby created conflicts of loyalty. They further sought to bind naxarars to themselves by providing them with Mongol wives. The source mentions such co-optation beginning after 1256, the year in which Hūlegū became Īl-Khān in Iran:

When Hūlegū saw the Georgian nobility which had come before him, received them affectionately and armed [them] to take them to battle with him. Some he appointed as uldač, that is, sword-bearing palace guards; some were designated sak'urč, that is, those who hold above the Khan's head a parasol with a rounded end, like a flag; and only those from the Khan's relatives had the right to fan; others were appointed lubçač--keepers of the wardrobe and shoes (basmat); others, evd[alrč, bodyguards; and one group also was designated lorč--holders of arrows and quivers. Thus did the Khan bestow these mean honors on the great princes of Georgia, and he considered each honored.

1.

1
 KC pp. 222-23; Mur. p. 98. Aknerc'i wrote: "Hūlegū--Khan greatly loved the Armenian and Georgian forces because of the extreme bravery which they displayed before him in all battles. Therefore he called them Bahaturs. He selected the young and handsome sons of the great princes of Armenia and Georgia and appointed them as his guards, styling them K'esikt'oyk'--guards with sword and bow" (GA p. 342). The Mongols also tried--obviously with limited success--to co-opt the allegiance of king David Lašaeen. From Batu-Khan of the Northern Tatars, David received "a parasol (suk'ur) which no one excepting the Khans and their relations have. [Batu] told Hūlegū that

Some naxarars--notably those enjoying injū status-- became pillars of Mongol administration in the Caucasus. Smbat Orbēlean and Sadun Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli are particularly good examples. In the early 1260's Smbat was deputized Hülegü's overseer of construction for the new Īl-Khānid summer residence of Ala-Tagh to the east of Lake Van¹.
Step'annos added:

...Hülegü so heeded his words that [Smbat] could have killed whomever he chose, or granted life to whomever he wanted. Consequently, everyone quaked with fear because of him, and everyone's eyes were upon him. 2.

with the exception of Hülegü noyin himself, when entering the Horde, no one should stand higher than the [Georgian] king...After the king reached his holdings, he went with great gifts to Hülegü-Khan. When the latter saw him, he received him with honor and placed him in front with the noyins, stipulating his place for standing, sitting, inquiring, and giving counsel" (KC pp. 230-32; Mur. pp. 104-105).

1

SO p. 161.

2

SO p. 168: "zi aynk'an lsoł'ēr Hulawun nma. zi um kamer mah tayr acel, ew um kamer keans snorher, vash proy amenavn ok' dołayr i nmane ew amenec un ačk' i na hayein".

Sadun, according to Aknerci, was to be allowed pardons for up to nine crimes, so much was he cherished by Hülegü¹. Tarsayič Orbēlean, following in his brother Smbat's steps was designated for extra special honors:

...So respected was he before Abaqa-Khān that on numerous occasions the latter removed from his person his own royal garments and clothed Tarsayič in them from head to toe, and girdled him with a belt of pure gold studded with costly gems and pearls... 2.

The loyalty and support of the mecatuns, or wealthy merchants who formed an important part of the new nobility of the 13th century were actively sought after by the Mongols from the first. In 1242, when the city of Karin/Erzerum was taken and its population massacred or enslaved, special consideration was shown to wealthy Armenians there³. According to Vardan Arew-

1
GA p. 348. Both Smbat and Sadun, and others besides made a point of learning Mongolian. According to SO, Smbat was "a skilled rhetorician, unbeatable at diwan court--for he spoke five languages: Armenian, Georgian, Uighur, Persian, and even Mongolian" (SO p. 151). See also KC p. 248; Mur. p. 120 where Sadun does simultaneous translation of Georgian and Mongolian at court. Grigor Mamikonean also knew Mongolian (KG p. 272).

2
SO p. 170: "ew avnk'an vargeal linēr afaji Apalay lanin or bazum angam zark avakan handerīn iwr merkac eal yanine naguc'aner Tarsayičin yotic' minšew c Glurū, ew zkamarn i hamak oskwoy bazmagin akambk' ew margartok' ic'eal tayr acei end mej nora..."

3
VA p. 147: "Now in the year 1242 Baiju noyin replaced the authority of Chormaghun and took the city of Karin, taking thence Umek, a man venerable, wealthy (mecatun)

elc'i, Hülegü utilized Armenian merchants as emissaries¹.

Finally, co-optation of allegiance was furthered by intermarriage with the naxarars. The Christian Caucasian literary sources alone mention eight examples of intermarriage between the Mongols (or officials in the Īl-Khānid administration) and the Christian Caucasian nobility: "Awag himself was given a Mongol bride named Eslom²; Hasan Jalal's daughter Ruzuk'an was wed to Chormaghun's son Bora noyin³; Xořak Awagean was married to the sahibdiwan

and fearful of the Lord, as well as his relations, the sons of paron Yohann, Step'annos, and his five brothers". KG p. 363: "But one wealthy merchant was respected by them. He was Umek, whom they called Asil, a benevolent man whom we recalled [above], who lived through the Mongols' destruction of the city of Karin, together with his sons Yovhannes, Step'annos and his brothers. At this time [late 1240's, early 1250's] he was dwelling in the city of Tiflis, and was called the 'father' of the Georgian king David. He was honored by the Khan in writing and by all the [Mongol] nobility. He gave generous gifts to Arghun and those with him, and was much esteemed by him... The sons of Sarawan named Snorhawor and Mkrtiř were also prosperous and wealthy".

1

VA pp. 154-55: "In the year 1265 great Hülegü the Īl-Khān summoned us by means of a man of the day, Snorhawor, more prominent than any, especially from among the laity. [He had come] from the governor of the north, Batu, where he went first and was honored, then [he was honored] by Hülegü Īl-Khān. [Snorhawor] took us along with his merchandise and pack animals". On Mongol relations with the Armenian Church, see Appendix C.

2

KG p. 263; KC p. 225; Mur. p. 100.

3

KG p. 391.

Shams ad-Dīn Juvaini¹; king David Lašaeen married Iawand Esugan, a relative of Chormaghun²; king Demetre's sister Tamar was married to emir Arghun's son³; Demitre's daughter Rusudan, to the son of Buqa⁴; king Vaxt'ang married Arghun-Khān's sister, Oljat⁵, who subsequently was wed to Vaxt'ang's successor king David⁶. Cilician sources mention a number of Cilician Armenian notables also who had Mongol spouses, and most likely the Armeno--Saljuq nobility similarly intermarried with Mongol noyins⁷.

1 SO p. 165.

2 SO p. 167; KC p. 251; Mur. p. 123.

3 KC p. 274; Mur. p. 144.

4 KC p. 281; Mur. p. 150. Also KC p. 285; Mur. p. 153.

5 KC p. 293; Mur. p. 160.

6 KC p. 297; Mur. p. 164.

7 Toward the end of the 13th century, despite protestations from the Church, the Armeno-Georgian lords began imitating the Mongol and Islamic practise of polygamy. Consequently a number of potentially powerful alliances were formed. Tarsayiġ Orbelean, for example, during the lifetime of his first wife, married Mina khatun Xalbakean of Xaġen (d. 1311) sister of Hasan Jalal (X. 10, 117, 175, 177, 267). One of Tarsayiġ's daughters was married into another branch of the Xalbakeans, while a second daughter became the wife of king Demitre's brother Manuel (SO p. 171). Sadun Arcruni took four wives, one of whom was king Demitre's only sister, Tamar (KC p. 278; Mur. p. 147). King Demitre himself had three wives, one of whom was the daughter of the powerful Beka Jaqeli of Samc'xe (KC pp. 282-83; Mur. 150-51). In the final decades of the 13th century, Orbeleans once again married into the Xalbakean family, and into the family of their rivals, the Arcruni/Mahkanaberdelis (SO p. 179).

During the Mongol domination de-naxararization occurred in Armenia as a result of different Mongol policies. During the 13th century, in some cases it was temporary and perhaps unintentional, such as the de-naxararization resulting from the Mongols' insistence that important lords visit the center of Mongol power (be it in Qara-Qorum in the Far East, or later in the Īl-Khānid centers of Iran and Armenia). Sometimes de-naxararization occurred through deaths of naxarars in foreign wars which, as Mongol clients, the naxarars were obliged to participate in. In other cases, de-naxararization was the result of intentional policy: punishment for rebellion and punishment for association with certain Mongol noyins who had fallen into disfavor. With the Islamization of the Mongol court in the 14th century and the concomitant inception of anti-Christian persecution, de-naxararization, by definition directed against one segment of society, degenerated into massacres (premeditated and "spontaneous") directed against all levels of Christian Armenian society.

Armenian and Georgian sources contain numerous references to the long and difficult journeys to the Far East undertaken by Caucasian lords. Apparently, the first naxarar to be sent to Qara-Qorum was Awag¹. Atabek Iwanē's renowned

1

KG pp. 262-63: "After a short time had passed, they sent Awag on a distant journey to the northeast to their king, called Khan. For they did the same to all the grandees whom they wished to honor. They sent him to the king and, receiving [their] ruler's command, implemented it, for

daughter (Awag's sister) T'amt'a was taken to Mongolia after the capture of Klat' (1245). After being kept there for "many years" she was allowed to return and reign over Klat'¹. Prior to the journey East of David Rusudanean, his royal mother sent Šahnšah, Awag, Vahram of Gag and Šota, the duke of Heret'i to the northern Batu-Khān². At almost the same time the Mongols retrieved from captivity David Lašaeen (the legitimate heir to the throne). He too was sent to the Khāns, first to Batu, then to Mōngke in Qara-Qorum. Accompanying David Lašaeen were Šahnšah's sons Zak'arē, Vahram's son

they were extremely obedient to their king. The prince himself was happy to go, so that perhaps his situation and that of the country be eased somewhat...

"Now Awag went before the great Khan and showed him letters from his commanders and recalled the reasons for his coming, that he had come to him in service. Once the great Khan heard that, he received Awag with affection, gave him a Tat'ar bride, and sent him to his country. He also wrote to his commanders to give Awag his lands, and with his help to subdue all the rebels, as happened".

1

Her release was arranged by queen Rusudan's envoy, Hamadola, when the latter himself was on a trip to the Far East (KG p. 292).

2

KC p. 192; Mur. p. 76.

Aibula Gageli, and Sargis T'mogveli. Batu kept with him Zak'arē and Aibula. David was sent East with Sargis "and a few other Georgians"¹. When David and his party arrived in Qara-Qorum, "they encountered king Narin David [David Rusudanean], atabek Awag, Surameli, Gamrekeli, and the amirejib Bešk'en"². Awag had been in Mongolia (or at least, out of Georgia) for some five years, according to the History of Kárt'li³. In the early 1250's Hasan Jalal also made the trip, first to Batu, then home to Xaçen, then, "after some days, being harassed by tax-collectors and by [the emir] Arghun, he went to Mōngke--Khān⁴. In the mid-1250's king Het'um of Cilician Armenia, with an entourage of princes and priests, made the journey to Mōngke, returning home after three and a half years⁵. Het'um's successors on the throne visited the Īl-Khānid

¹ KC p. 219; Mur. p. 96.

² KC p. 220; Mur. p. 96.

³ KC p. 220; Mur. p. 97.

⁴ KG p. 359. See our Appendix C.

⁵ KG pp. 364-65. On Het'um's journey see J.A. Boyle's article, "The Journey of He'tum I, King of Little Armenia, to the Court of the Great Khān Mōngke", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964) pp. 175-89, also Het'um the Historian, p. 47.

court in Tabrīz¹. Smbat Orbēlean visited the Far East twice in that same decade, the first time (1252) remaining for three years². In 1274, Smbat died at the Īl-Khānid court in Tabrīz³. For our purposes, it is irrelevant whether the nobles were sent to the Khāns as deputies or whether they travelled voluntarily. The effect was the same: the removal from Armenia of the most powerful (and potentially the most dangerous) lords. In the absence of certain grandees, other lords could and did attempt to encroach upon their rivals' lands and rights. Though this form of de-naxararization may have been temporary, the centrifugal results promoted by it were not.

More costly in terms of human life was the de-naxararization resulting from the obligation of the lords to participate with their cavalry in Mongol campaigns⁴. Because the Mongols considered their subject peoples

¹ Lewon (Het'um p. 57); Het'um II (Het'um p. 221); Lewon paron Het'um and other princes travelled to Bularghu who treacherously murdered them in 1309 (14CC p. 56).

² SO p. 155. It was probably during those three years that Smbat learned some of his five languages (SO p.151). Mamikonids visited the Khan in the 1260's (VT p. 108).

³ SO p. 166.

⁴ KG p. 269; GA p. 297.

expendable, they usually designated them as advance--
attackers. This was not, as the History of K'art'li
and Grigor Aknerc'i would have us believe, because the
Armeno-Georgian troops were such excellent warriors, but
first, precisely because the Caucasians were expendable
and second, because desertion was impossible with foreign
troops fighting in front or in detachments surrounded by
Mongols. Deserters were killed. This fact perhaps
accounts for the "valor" so extensively recounted in the
sources, and so reminiscent in spirit to those epic
descriptions of naxarar single-combat exploits found in
the Arsacid sources. The Caucasian troops had a simple
choice facing them: life and the spoils of victory, or
death from defeat or attempted desertion.

Also facing the lords (at least in western historical Armenia)
were the Armenian and Georgian defenders of their own
country, Rūm. Armenians and Georgians fought and died
on both sides¹. With the subjugation of western Armenia,
the obligation of military service to the Mongol overlords
did not end. The lords and their troops were taken on
campaigns all over the Middle East, North Africa, and Asia.

¹
KC p. 192; Mur. p. 77; GA p. 309.

De-naxararization in this instance involved the removal of powerful military men from the Caucasus "temporarily" during campaigns of varying durations, and permanently, through death in foreign lands.

According to the History of K'art'li, the stringent requirements involved in participating in Mongol campaigns were a major cause of the Caucasian princes' rebellion of 1259-61:

...The Georgians were menaced because [the Mongols] were fighting a protracted and uninterrupted war [lasting 7 years] against the Assassins, while the Georgians were fighting along with them, divided into two sections. Each [Georgian] ruler was apportioned [to the service of] one noyin... 1.

...[The Georgian lords] all wondered: 'What shall we do without someone of the royal line to guide us and fight against the Tatars? We are disunited and unable to resist them. So wickedly do they menace us that we go off to Alamut each year, withstanding all sorts of troubles and dangers. 2.

It is true that the Mongols placed considerable trust in certain Armenian lords, such as amirspasalar Šahnšah's son Zak'arē and Ptoš Xalbakēan who aided in the capture of Baghdad (1258)³. The honors bestowed upon the noted

¹ KC p. 208; Mur. p. 88

² KC p. 214; Mur. p. 93.

³ KG pp. 380, 384, 385.

military man Tarsayiĉ Orbēlean by Abaqa-Khān are also noteworthy¹.

Often the Caucasians suffered decimation . In 1261 many Armenian and Georgian warriors died when Mongol general Kitbuqa's army in Egypt was wiped out². Prince Sewada Iaĉenc'i was killed in the battle for Mayyāfārikīn³. In 1261/62 (710 A.E.) the young prince Burt'el Orbēlean died in the North Caucasus, fighting Hūlegū's enemy, Berke⁴. Caucasians died in the war

¹ SO p. 170: "...And because [Tarsayiĉ] was a man powerful and intrepid, warlike, and of astounding size, wherever he went he displayed great valor in all warfare: in Khurasan, Syria, Rum, in Hams and Ham, among the Egyptians and in Darband. Nine times personally did he direct the battle, as a consequence of which he was honored with many great gifts by the King of Kings and received a golden balis which was flat, the size of a fig, and in weight one liter--for such was the honor of victory".

² KG pp. 388-89.

³ VA p. 152.

⁴ SO p. 162; GIA v. III p. 218 (foldout).

between Arghun-Khān and Baraq in the mid-1260's in Central Asia¹. In the late 1270's, Caucasian troops suffered dreadful losses during the Mongols' ill-conceived expeditions in Gīlān, on the southern shore of the Caspian Sea², while in 1282 Caucasian contingents fighting again in Egypt were all but wiped out³. In 1283, in Khurāsān, the Georgian king Demitre and his army participated on the wrong side in a succession struggle between Ahmad and the eventual victor, Arghun--Khān⁴. Shortly thereafter the king and his troops were taken north to suppress a rebellion in Darband⁵. Geikhātu-Khān crushed a rebellion in Rūm with the army of Demitre's son, David while another part of the Caucasian

1 KC pp. 262-64; Mur. pp. 133-35.

2 KC p. 276; Mur. p. 145.

3 According to BH p. 457, in 1277 some 2,000 Georgians (i.e., Caucasians) were killed in Egypt; KC pp. 278-80 Mur. pp. 146-49; Het'um pp. 58-59; BH p. 464 mentions 5,000 Caucasian troops fighting in Egypt.

4 KC p. 284; Mur. p. 152.

5 KC p. 285; Mur.p. 153.

troops remained on alert in Mūghān¹. Around 1305, immediately preceding Khar-Banda's conversion to Islam, king Giorgi and various princes were fighting in Iconium². De-naxararization through participation in Mongol expeditions resulted in more than the deaths of thousands of men. In the absence of the naxarar warlords, the Caucasus was left without committed defenders to protect it from the persistent raids and sorties of Mongols, Turks and local rebels.

De-naxararization also was achieved directly by execution, the ordinary punishment for disloyalty, real or perceived. The lordly participants in the abortive Caucasian uprising of 1248/49, though arrested and condemned to death, nonetheless were released, thanks mostly to the humanity of Awag's Mongol friend, general Chaghatai. However the rebels' properties were ravaged in reprisal³. Response to the second rebellion of 1259-61 was less restrained. Unable to vent their anger on the participants immediately, the Mongols

¹ KC p. 296; Mur. p. 162.

² KC p. 324; Mur. p. 188.

³ KG pp. 320-21; VA p. 148.

destroyed the mausolea of the Georgian kings at Gelat¹, and the kat'olikosate at Aclor¹, and then arrested the naxarar relatives of the rebels:

[Emir] Arghun seized the Georgian queen Gonc'a, her daughter Košak', the great prince Sahnšah, Hasan Jalal, lord of Xaçen, and many others because of debts and taxes [owed]. These people gave much treasure and barely saved their lives.²

Hasan Jalal, however, was tortured to death in 1261³. The

¹ KG p. 390.

² ibid: "...ew i kalans arar zt'aguhin vrac' zGonc'avn, ew zdustr iwr, zXošak' n, ew zixann mec zSahnšah, ew zJalaln Hasan zter Xaçenoy, ew zavls bazums patcafanok' partuc' ew harki, voroc' bazum ganls afeal, haziw zercan i mahuane".

³ KG pp. 390-91: "But the pious and virtuous prince Jalal was molested by impossible tortures, as they demanded more taxes from him than he could pay. They put wood on his neck and irons on his feet. They dealt with him in this manner because of his strong Christianity, for all the Muslims were inimical to him and urged Arghun to kill him, saying: 'He more [than others] is hostile to our religion and laws'. For Arghun also was Muslim. He took [Jalal] to Qazvin. Meanwhile Jalal bore everything with praise, for he was very well versed in Scripture, fasting and praying, modest in food and drink and desirous of a martyr's death.

"Now Jalal's daughter Ruzuk'an, wife of Bora noyin (son of Chormaghun, first general of the Tatars) went to Hülegü's wife [the Nestorian Christian] Toguz khatun to free her father from Arghun's clutches. When the impious ostikan [Arghun] learned this, he immediately sent executioners and had the blessed and just man killed during the night. The impious executioners went and tore Jalal's body into pieces...in 1261/62 (710 A.E.)".

next year, Zak'arē was murdered¹.

As was pointed out in another connection, the closeness of certain Caucasian lords to suddenly-disgraced Mongol noyins was fatal. Thus in 1289, when Arghun-Khān crushed a plot against himself organized by the emir Buqa, he also executed king Demitre of Georgia who had married Buqa's daughter and was, rightly or wrongly, implicated. Similarly, when Geikhatu succeeded his brother Arghun as Khān in 1291, he in turn killed off Arghun's prominent supporters, among whom were many Armenians².

1

KG p. 393: "Now it happened that Zak'arē was with Arghun and his many troops in Georgia. And Zak'are went unbeknownst to Arghun and the other soldiers to see his wife who was with her father Sargis, prince of Urtik', one of the rebels with the Georgian king David. When Arghun learned about this, he notified Hülegü who himself ordered that Zak'are be taken shackled. He heaped other false accusations upon him, ordered him killed, dismembered, and thrown to the dogs. And when his father Sahnsah in the village of Ojun heard the bad news, he became aggrieved and died of sorrow".

2

See below chapter two p. 122 notes 1 and 2.

Triumph of the Turkmens

The barely controllable, plunder-hungry Turkmen element which formed the mainstay of the armies of the Saljuq conquerors of the 11th century also participated in all subsequent Turco-Mongol invasions. It had no interest in good government or the maintenance of order. On the contrary, the nomadic Turkmens solely were concerned with the aggrandizement of portable wealth. The lives of despoiled populations were of no value to them, unless such populations could be sold into slavery. Yet, as was pointed out earlier, all Saljuqs and all Mongols did not share these aims. Consequently, centralizing forces within both the Saljuq and Mongol governments were obliged to support a very delicate balance. On the one hand, the warlike Turkmens were the best, most determined fighters and so were necessary for victorious expeditions. On the other hand, the Turkmens' impulse to destroy all and move on had to be fought--sometimes literally-- in order for the more sedentary elements to impose taxation on the conquered peoples, and exploit them in a more systematic fashion. But eventually the Turkmens were victorious, destroying both organized Turkish and Mongol states. Destructive nomadism of the Turkmen type (essentially a type of economic parasitism) also was practised by some Kurdish and Arab groups operating in southern and southwestern Armenia.

The initial Mongol expedition of 1220/21 was in the Caucasus primarily for reconnaissance. Apart from reporting the pilfering of herds and the sack of some few cities, the Caucasian sources do not dwell on unbridled Turkmen activity at that time. This reconnaissance army was disciplined and obedient to its commanders.

The nature of Turkmen activity becomes clearer with the destructive sojourn of Jalāl al-Dīn on the Armenian highlands (1225-ca. 1230). During these five bloody years, Jalāl held the loyalty of the Turkmen in his company by giving them full rein, and directing them especially against Christians. While the actual devotion to Islam of Jalāl or of his rude hordes is questionable, his technique of directing rampages against Christians effectively satisfied the army's lust for plunder and simultaneously provided a religious justification for its actions. Jalāl's career was that of a Turkmen brigand and he died the death of an unsuccessful brigand chief. He was abandoned by the army when he was unable to provide it with more loot. With his murder, as we have seen, Turkmen in small bands continued harassing sedentary populations and caravans all over the Middle East .

When the Mongols returned in 1236, the Turkmen element in their midst was satiated somewhat by the sack of resisting cities. However, even in this early period of Mongol rule,

when the central government was at its strongest, there is evidence of irregularities. For example, the Armenian city of Surb Mari (Surmalu) was sacked by the regular Mongol army, but then ravished a second time by a certain noble named Lara Bahatur¹. Similarly, during the taking of Western Armenia, though it was Mongol policy to spare surrendering cities, some were sacked nonetheless, because chieftains could not control their men, or (perhaps better) because so many chieftains themselves were inclined to plunder. The centrifugal nomadic element was unaccustomed to and uninterested in sedentary government and its forms. The Turco-Mongol nomads were unhappy at the fixed rates of taxation imposed on subject populations. Indeed, their constant illegal exactions were the root cause behind each Caucasian rebellion². Nor, clearly, did this element fancy the exalted stations given to some of the Caucasian nobles. For example, the death of Awag's influential patron, the Mongol general Chormaghun in 1242/43 led to an increase in disorders of all sorts. Turkmens immediately plotted (unsuccessfully) to murder Awag³. When the same

1
KG p. 260.

2
KG pp. 263-64; GA pp. 321, 323.

3
KG p. 264.

elements in the army learned about plans for a Caucasian rebellion (1249/50):

...suddenly all the nobility of the Tatar army held a council, armed, and universally wanted to ravage the lands of Armenia and Georgia, [lands] obedient to them, because the Georgian king sought to rebel with all the princes...[the Mongols] wanted generally to destroy everyone. 1.

Awag's patron and friend Chaghatai prevented this, and in a dramatic appeal to the furious Mongols presented the views of the central government, barely preventing a massacre of the captured naxarars:

...One of the senior leaders, general of the entire army named Chaghatai, a friend of Awag, came amidst the armed troops and said to them: 'We have no order from the Khan to kill those who are obedient to us, stand in service to us, and pay taxes to the Khan. And the reality of their rebellion is not certain. But if we destroy them without cause, you will be responsible to the Khan. 2.

Though the naxarars were not executed, the Turkmens, nonetheless, were allowed to vent their rage on the Caucasian

1

KG p. 319: "...yankarcaki xorhurd arareal amenayn awaganin t'at ar zorun, varec an zinu ew kazmec an af hasarak kotorel zašxarha Hayoc ew vrac zhnazandeals iwreanc, vasn aypisai patcafi, te apastambel kami t'agaworn vrac amenayn isxanok n...kamein af hasarak kotorel zamenešin".

2

KG p. 320: "...Mi omn yawag glxaworac'n, or sōravar ēr amenayn zorun, Całatav anun nora, or barekamm er Awagin,

population¹.

Centrifugal elements within the Mongol army of occupation were not the only ones facing Armenians and Georgians. According to Bar Hebraeus and the History of K'art'li, in the 1230's and 1240's, remnants of Jalāl al-Dīn's nomadic Khwārazmian army entered Georgia and harassed the settled population². Khwārazmian mercenaries also operated in the Mayyāfārikin area in southwestern Armenia during the 1240's³. In 1255, Mongol rebels despoiled

ekac' i mēl vafeal zōrac'n ew agē c'nosa. 'Mek' oč' unink' hraman i lanen kočorel zavnosik, or hnazandea en mez ew kan mez i cafavut ean ew harkatuk en lanin. ew irk' apstambut ean noc a čs čsmarteal. Ard' et' a kotokek' znosa atanc patčafi, duk' tayk' patasxani lanin".

1

KG pp. 320-21: "[The Mongols] attacked Georgia, falling upon many districts of the rebels and non-rebels. They cut down many people and took even more captive; a countless multitude of men, women and children they drowned in the river. And this took place in 1249/50 (698 A.E.)". VA p. 148: "...Countless numbers were killed and enslaved, villages and fields [were destroyed], and they disgraced women in Armenia, but more so in Georgia" .

2

BH p. 402; KC pp. 212-15; Mur. pp. 91-92.

3

BH p. 403.

villages around Melitene/Malatya¹, and still were active in the same area at the close of the decade². Furthermore, the arrival in Hülegü's realm of some seven of Chingiz-Khān's unruly grandchildren from the North, and their partial settlement in the Caucasus (mid-1250's) introduced another centrifugal force given over to pillaging. In the late 1250's the Caucasus was ravaged by one of these arrivals, Iul³. In 1268 another of the émigrés, Tegüder, rebelled from the Īl-Khāns, causing chaos and destruction in Armenia and Georgia⁴.

Because of anti-Islamic feeling among the Mongols at the time of the invasion, the shamanist Turkmens' rage often was channeled against Muslims--much to the delight of beleaguered Christians. However, Mongol religious policy was quite complex, and underwent numerous shifts. For example, at the time of the census conducted by Arghun and Buqa (1243), Kirakos said that Buqa "...had assembled brigands from among the Persians and Tačiks, who mercilessly performed deeds of cruelty

1 BH p. 420.

2 BH pp. 425-26.

3 GA pp. 327, 329.

4 KC pp. 258-67; Mur. pp. 129-37.

and were especially inimical toward the Christians"¹. Yet in 1258, during the siege of Baghdad, the Mongols encouraged the Christians in their army brutally to exterminate the city's Muslim population. But in retaliation for the Caucasian rebellion of 1259-61, Mongols destroyed churches and the Georgian kat'olikosate itself, and the emir Arghun (himself a Muslim) had the Christian prince Hasan Jalal tortured to death for failure to apostasize². Clearly, Mongols adroitly used the Christians in Muslim areas and the Muslims in Christian Caucasia for espionage and maintenance of terror.

With the increasing Islamization of the Mongols, their policy changed. Once again, as had happened during the invasions of the Saljuqs and the Khwarazmians, fanatical Islam was wed to the nomads' lust for booty. From toward the end of the 13th century to beyond the end of the 14th century, anti-Christian persecutions prevailed almost uninterruptedly. What earlier had been punishment meted out to an occasionally recalcitrant naxarar became the generalized fate of all Christians refusing to convert. Nomads of all kinds of backgrounds, circulating in different

1

KG p. 313: "...zi žoloveal ēr iwr ara srikavs i parsic' sw i tačkac' ork' anxnay gorceinzgore xakut' san sw t' snamik' ein afawel k' ristoneic".

2

KG pp. 390-91.

parts of the Armenian highlands, attacked churches, monasteries, wealthy and poor Christians. Already in the late 1270's Turkmens killed Sargis, the influential bishop of Erzinjan¹. In 1290, the anti-Christian lord of Mayyāfārikin had the Armenian lord of Muš assassinated and then persecuted the monks of Tarōn². In 1290/91 a peripatetic Armenian priest, Grigor, was killed at Xarberd, and 45 Armenian mecatuns in the city were arrested. It is interesting that this episode is recounted both in Bar Hebraeus³ and in an Armenian martyrology. In the Armenian account, the Mongol governor barely restrained a Muslim mob from killing the 45 merchants. This scene is reminiscent of Kirakos' account of Chaghatai's rescue of the arrested naxarars (1249/50). It is one of the last examples of such restraint to be found in the sources:

...But a certain chief named T'at'laray, of the Nation of the Archers, got up, mounted a horse, .. [came] with his troops, snatched the bound [prisoners] away from them and set them free in peace. Then he threatened [the would-be killers] saying: 'Were you to slay such citizens, what answer should I give to the world-conquering Khan by whom I was sent to guard this city?' 4.

1 SA p. 162. Samuēl's continuator places the murder in 1272, though the Annals of Bishop Step'annos (MC vol. 1 p. 44) puts it in 1276. See above ch. two pp. 120-21 n. 1.

2 BH p. 484.

3 BH pp. 483-84.

4 ANM p. 115.

In the coming decades, no "answer" would have been necessary, as anti-Christian persecution became policy. Such persecutions, executions, confiscations, and destructions of churches were reported from all parts of historical Armenia¹. Anti-Christian persecution was launched formally with the plundering and killing exped-

1

For the first decade of the 14th century, surviving colophons speak of persecutions and confiscations at Alt'amar (14CC p. 41), and of Turkmen attacks on Tayk'/ Tao (KC pp. 310-12; Mur. pp. 175-77). During the second decade there were destructions of monasteries in parts of northeastern Armenia (14CC p. 66), and at Karin (14CC p. 102, also the martyrdom of bishop Grigor Karneç'i d. 1321/22 ANM pp. 121-27), persecutions in southern Armenia at Alt'amar (14CC p. 114), Varaga (14CC pp. 136-37), Berkri (14CC p. 144), Sebastia (14CC p. 163). The third decade brought a slight relaxation of the terror, but soon it escalated again (VT p. 164). In the fourth decade, persecution was reported from Iranian Tabriz (14CC p. 283), Lofi in northern Armenia (14CC p. 249), Alt'amar (14CC p. 259), Goät'n (14CC p. 281), and Erzänjan. This last city was attacked by a coalition of Mongols, Turkmens and Kurds (14CC p. 305). In the fifth decade persecutions, brigandage, and massacres continued at Erzänjan (14CC p. 325), Tayk' (14CC p. 327), Bayburt and Tevrike (14CC p. 369), C'ina (14CC p. 379) and between 1350 and 1360 occurred at Alt'amar (14CC pp. 405, 414), Erzänjan (14CC p. 411), and B'jni (VT pp. 169-70). In the seventh decade there were persecutions, expulsions, massacres and destructions of churches in Hayoc' Jor near Julamerik (14CC p. 458) and Muš (14CC p. 483). Reference to persecutions in the above cities should not be taken to mean that persecutions occurred solely there and solely at that date. Anti-Christian terror was a permanent feature of the 14th century and it was general throughout the Armenian highlands, north, south, east, and west, though its scale and intensity did vary greatly.

tions of Nauruz (1295/96) during the reign of Ghazan-Khān. Whether or not Ghazan at first knew about Nauruz' activities is disputed from source to source. Granted, Nauruz eventually was hunted down and executed at Ghazan's command, with Christian Caucasians gleefully participating. But by then, the Turkmens were no longer controllable.

Not surprisingly, the "hellish and bitter" 14th century did not produce literary historians such as Kirakos, Vardan, or Step'annos. The disorganized history of T'ovma Mecop'ec'i (d. ca. 1446) does speak of the last three decades of the 14th century, but for the first seven decades, only the humble authors of chronicles and colophons, many of them anonymous, detail the persecutions, plunderings of churches and famines. They do not speak of land disputes among naxarars--many of whom already had quit the country, had apostasized, or been killed.

In the 1320's, Grigor, bishop of Karin/Erzerum was killed after refusing to convert¹. In 1334 Christians were obliged to wear special blue badges as a visible indicator of their subordinate status², just as economically

¹ SA p. 167 dates this in 1321/22, while ANM p. 123 has 1326/27.

² SA p. 165.

their subordinate status was made formal years before (1301/2) by the inception of the kharaġ tax, an annual tax on Christians¹. The requirement of the blue badge, kerchief, or hat, to set the Christians apart from Muslims was observed by the Bavarian captive, Johann Schiltberger around 1400, and so was a feature of the entire 14th century².

With the breakdown of the Īl-Khānid government in the 1330's, various Turkmen, Mongol, and Kurdish bands became completely unchecked. For example, in 1343, the Qara Qoyunlu (Black Sheep) Turkmens (who had established bases in Bagrewand and Kajberunik' in the late 13th century) were ceaselessly raiding around Xlat'³. The Spanish Muslim traveller Ibn Battuta in 1333 noted that Karin/Erzerum was "mostly in ruins as a consequence of a factional feud which broke out between two groups of Turkmens there"⁴. During the 1330's and 1340's, the cities of Erzñjan, Sebastia/Sīvās, and Karin/Erzerum were under almost constant seige by rival nomadic groups⁵.

1 SA p. 165.

2 JS p. 74.

3 14CC p. 334.

4 Battūta p. 437.

5 SA pp. 167-69.

Xlat' was captured by Turkmens in 1359¹. Furthermore, in the 1380's, Tīmūr's detachments frequently battled with Qara Qoyunlu and Kurdish groups. In the Çapağjur and Muş areas and near Karin/Erzerum, the Turkmens successfully resisted Tīmūr's advance². In 1382 Turkmen groups were fighting in the plain of Artaz³. During his second invasion (1395) Tīmūr raided Turkmen areas centered at Arčēš on Lake Van's northern shore⁴.

Concomitant with the chaos occasioned by warring nomads went persecution of Christians--especially of the clerical nobility. In 1387/88, Step'annos, archbishop of Sebastia/Sīvās was executed for failure to convert. His monastery of St. Nšan was converted into a dervish sanctuary, and other churches there were demolished⁵. In 1393/94, kat'olikos Zak'aria of Alt'amar and the kat'olikos of Sis, T'ēodoros both were executed⁶. Between

1 SA p. 169.

2 TM p. 21.

3 SA p. 170.

4 TM pp. 46-47.

5 ANM pp. 144-45.

6 SA p. 172.

1403 and 1406, according to the Spanish ambassador Clavijo, Tīmūr demolished the churches of Erznjan and Bekafid¹.

The triumph of the Turkmens drained Armenia² in numerous ways. H. Manandyan and L. Babayan have observed the collapse of Armenia's economy, pointing out the incompatibility of the nomadic economic system with the agricultural and mercantile economy of Armenia.² The Mongols expropriated for their own use vast tracts of land in Armenia, taking certain choice farming areas for summer and winter pasturage for their herds. The slopes of the Aragac mountains, and the areas of Vayoc' Jor, parts of the plain of Ayrarat, and areas around Karin/Erzerum, Van, Berkri, and Balesh/Bitlis became summer vaylas, while Vaspurakan, the Ayrarat plains and the Xarberd region were used for wintering places³. These areas formerly had been under intensive agricultural development, but increasingly in the late 13th and in the 14th century they became semi-desert⁴. Parts of southern

1 Clav. pp. 130, 138.

2 H.A. Manandyan, Trade, chp. VI pp. 201-202, chp. VI passim; L.H. Babayan, Aknarkner minadarvan havastani patmut' iwnic [Episodes from the History of Medieval Armenia], Koçvorakan feodalakan tntesajevi tirapetut' van hetevank nere nstakyac' zoçovurdneri tntesakan kvank' i vra [Consequences of the Dominance of the Nomadic Feudal Economic System on the Economic Life of Sedentary Peoples]" [Episodes] pp. 77-119.

3 Episodes p.83.

4 HAP p. 657.

and western Armenia were used almost solely for animal husbandry. The Mongols and Turkmen nomads used the area between Erznjan, Bayberd, and Sebastia/Sīvās, and areas around Van and in Diyārbakr for these purposes, also¹. Not only was good farmland allowed to desiccate, but with the mass enslavings and deportations of whole villages, there were even fewer farmers; and with the mass theft of livestock, remaining farmers often were deprived of their only source of power for pulling the plow.

A part of the Caucasian land-owning class also was deprived of land and driven to bankruptcy by the Mongols' excessive tax demands. Already by the time of the princes' rebellion of 1259-61, the sources speak of the impoverishment of some of the princes:

...With [the rebel king David] went many other great princes of districts who were harassed and harried, bankrupt, and who had mortgaged cities and districts, but were still unable to satiate the evil, leech-like appetite [of the Mongols]. 2.

¹ HAP p. 658.

² KG p. 389: "...end nma ew ayl mecamec iṣxank' gawafac' nelealk ew tarapealk', caxealk ew graw edealk' zk'alak' a ew ṣṣawars, ew oṣ karac ealk' yagec uc anel zanyags est nmanut ean ṣar tṣrkac'".

At the same time that certain large landholders were selling their estates, a few Mongol favorites such as Sahmadin, Umek, Snorhawor and Sadun Arcruni were purchasing them and became landholders after the example of the Mongol aristocrats, owning huge properties in different states¹. However, the wealth of these few lords, accumulated from trading and land speculation, cannot serve as an index of the country's prosperity.

The decline of Armenia's cities in this period was caused by Turkmen ravages, excessive taxation, and by the transferal of the international trade routes. Rashīd al-Dīn speaking about the disastrous situation at the beginning of the 14th century, wrote that five of every ten houses were deserted, and that numerous cities on both sides of the Euphrates had been abandoned². Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazvīnī noted the decline of cities and towns in Caucasia across the Armenian highlands in his day (1340). Speaking of Georgia and Abkazia, he stated that "revenues in time of their native kings amounted to near 5,000,000 dinars of the present currency; but in our times the government only obtains 1,202,000 dinars"³. About Rūm, which embraced western Armenia, he said: "Its revenues at the present day amount to 3,300,000

¹ HAP p. 657.

² Rashīd, III pp. 308-309; Yov. Yiš. p. 992.

³ Q p. 94.

dinars as set down in the registers; but during the time of the Saljuqs they were in excess of 15,000,000 dinars of the present currency"¹. The walls of Sebastia/Sivās were in ruins²; Awnik was in ruins³; Bayburt "was a large town; it is now but a small one"⁴; Muš "in former times a large city, but now a ruin"⁵; Berkri "a small town, that was a large place formerly"⁶; "Van is a fortress and Vastan (Ostan) was a large town formerly, but now only of medium size"⁷. Xlat' "is the capital of this province [Greater Armenia] and its revenues in former days amounted to near 2,000,000 dinars of the present currency; but now the total sum paid is only 390,000 dinars"⁸. Until the Saljuq invasions, Siwnik' had some

1
Q p. 95.

2
ibid.

3
Q p. 96.

4
ibid.

5
Q p. 105.

6
Q p. 100.

7
Q. p. 101.

8
Q. p. 100.

1,000 villages, while at the end of the 13th century, the figure had declined by 331 to 677 villages. According to Samuēl of Ani and Matthew of Edessa, the former Arcerunid kingdom in Vaspurakan had over 4,000 villages, but 13th and 14th century authors speak of that area with distress, as if describing a desert¹. Furthermore, in the 1350's the trade routes shifted away from the northern cities of Ani and Kars, to southern cities of Klat', Mayyāfārikīn/Np'rkert, and Arčēš, helping to impoverish northeastern Armenia². Not surprisingly, it is precisely from the mid-14th century that the great naxarar families of northeastern Armenia quickly fade from the sources, literary and inscriptional. Influential Zak'arids, Vaçuteans and Prošceans (known as guch, and not by a different surname) are unknown after 1360, and noteworthy Orbēleans and Dop'eans are mentioned last at the end of the 14th century³.

An important aspect of the Turkmens' triumph concerns the settlement of Turco-Mongol populations across the Armenian highlands. Regrettably, the sources do not contain much information on this question. The sources mention Mongols established in the area between Erzizjan

¹ HAP p. 661.

² Manandyan, Trade, pp. 197-200.

³ HAP pp. 642-44. R. Hewsen's articles ("The Meliks" in REA) have demonstrated the probable survival of "noble" status within melik families descended from the naxarars

Bayburt and Sebastia/Sivās; Qara-Qoyunlu Turkmen in the Lake Van basin; Aq-Qoyunlu Turkmen in the Amida-Diyārbakr area¹. Presumably some of those areas of southern and western Armenia which the nomads used for their yaylas eventually were transformed into sedentary communities. In the 1403-1406 period, Clavijo encountered but two yaylas, one near Bekafič and the other in Ernĵak, though clearly there must have been more². Johan Schiltberger speaks of Turkmens in the Samsun area, renting pasturage³. With time, more and more Turkmens began settling in or near cities. Clavijo observed that both Erziĵan and Ani--two traditionally Armenian cities--had Turkmen governors, and that Bekafič had an Armenian and a Turkish suburb⁴.

¹ Episodes p. 86.

² Clav. pp. 138, 148.

³ JS p. 14.

⁴ Clav. pp. 138-39, 333.

Naxarar Reactions to Mongol Control Techniques of the
13-14th Centuries

Naxarar reactions to the different control techniques used by the Mongols before and after their Islamization were varied, but contained no elements previously unknown in the long history of the naxarars. We have observed naxarar reaction to the invasions: when united military resistance proved impossible, the naxarars holed up in their mountain fortresses; when they learned that the Mongols spared those submitting peaceably, the naxarars submitted, making separate often highly advantageous arrangements with their new overlords. As for the domination, naxarar reactions to Mongol control techniques in the 13-14th centuries may be grouped under five major headings. The lords (1) attempted when possible to exploit the rivalry between different centers of Mongol authority; (2) rebelled, when feeling themselves sufficiently powerful or when driven to it by Mongol excesses; (3) emigrated from the Armenian highlands in large numbers; (4) Islamized in large numbers, and (5) withstood everything, retaining the Christian faith and also a certain leverage with the Turco-Mongol régimes. Some lords of totally impregnable fortresses became caravan-looters and bandits. Other lords sometimes were able to retain certain privileges and even family lands through the process of giving their

lands to religious establishments under the control of clerical representatives of the secular lord's own family.

The naxarars traditionally attempted to exploit big power rivalries whenever they believed that they stood to gain leverage thereby. This required the existence of two or more foreign rivals powerful enough potentially to balance each other and also willing to intervene militarily or diplomatically in the Caucasus. Did such a situation exist in the 13-14th centuries? At certain times it did, although it did not produce the results hoped for by the naxarars. The two Mongol rivals were the Il-Khān state in Iran, centered at Tabrīz, and the state of the Norther Tatars (the Golden Hōrde) centered at Sarai on the Volga river. The rivalry between these two, which broke into open warfare in the mid-1260's, manifested itself at least twenty years earlier. Influence over the Caucasus, which each side regarded as its own, was but one factor in this dispute, but the crucial one from the standpoint of certain Caucasian lords seeking maneuverability.

At the time of the Mongol conquest (1236), queen Rusudan of Georgia fled for safety to the distant city of Kutais in northwestern Georgia. The Mongols sent emissaries (including Armenian naxarars) to her demanding her submission and that she send them her son David Rusudanean

...But she did not do so, and instead sent Iwane's son Awag who was among/in the Tatar army (=had already submitted) with a few soldiers to the Tatars, saying: 'Until the ambassador whom I sent to the Khan your king returns, I cannot come to you. 1.

It was at this point that the enraged Mongols enthroned Rusudan's nephew, the legitimate heir, David Lašaeen:

Now when David's aunt Rusudan heard about this, she fled to Abxazia and Svanetia with her son, the other David (i.e. David Rusudanean), and sent ambassadors to the other Tatar commander, Batu, a relative of the Khan... She offered him her submission. Batu ordered her to reside in Tiflis, and no one opposed this, since during this time the [Great] Khan had died. 2.

Rusudan's plans were thwarted when the Mongols decided to enthrone both Davids, indicating that two could play the same game. But with the deepening of hostilities between the Īl-Khāns and the Northern Tatars, the question of Georgian allegiance became crucial. Indeed, years later, when Hülegü was planning to kill hostage members of king David Lašaeen's family, he was prudently stopped by his wife:

1
 KG p. 288: "...Isk na zavs oġ arareal' tay sakaw zōrre ew i jeŋn kwagin, ordwoyn iwanei, or er end T' at ar zorun. vie ar nosa aselov. Min'ew e skeal despann im, zor y'ec' i ar xalann, ark' ayn ier, oġ karem gal ar jez".

2
 KG p. 289: "Isk hōrak' oyr nora Ruzudan' ibrew luaw zayn, p'areaw y'ap' xazet' ew i Svanet' ordwoyn iwrov miws Dawt aw ew y'ec' despans ar miws zoraglux t' at' arin, orum' anun ar Bat' u, azgakan lanin... kal nma hnazand. Ew na hramayec'

Remember too that your brother, the great Khan Batu's son [Berke] has sent many emissaries and given great gifts [to David] so that they give[him] the Darial [pass] and the western highway, and that both are in his (David's) hands ...for should the army of Batu's ulus and that of the [Georgian] king unite, there shall be great disorder. 1.

In the very last years of the 13th century once again the Georgian king attempted alliance with the Northern Tatars, sending his son and brother to them. Despite his disloyalty, the Il-Khāns were sufficiently concerned to seek reconciliation with the king "so that the king would swear an oath of loyalty to Ghazan, and not permit passage to Batu's grandson, the great Khān Toqta"². With the deterioration of the sources in the 14th century, references to alliances with the Northern Tatars disappear. However, the Northern connection remained a double-edged sword, as the events of the late 1380's were to prove.

Was the Georgian royal family alone among the lords to attempt using the Golden Horde for leverage? Apparently not. Hasan Jalal believed that he could achieve maneuverability similarly. It was from Batu that Hasan received injū status (ca. 1257) although eventually he too was

nma nstel i Tp'xis, ew sok'a oġ anddimac'an, k'anzi end awurs end ays mēfēal er lann".

1

KC pp. 245-46; Mur. p. 118.

2

KC pp. 303-304; Mur. p. 169.

thwarted by local Mongols and had to visit the Great Khān Mōngke to complain¹. Probably, however, naxarar attempts to play off the two inimical Mongol states were not common.

It is interesting that at the very end of our period, after all of Tīmūr's decimations, enslavements and executions we find at least one naxarar seeking leverage from the rivalry of two strong powers. The Armenian governor of Erzīnjan, called Taharten by Clavijo and T'axrat'an by T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, was blamed by Clavijo for causing strife and warfare between his Ottoman lord Bāyazīd, and Tīmūr:

Now the causes that led to the Sultan of the Turks having knowledge of the Mongol Tartars and what indeed brought Timur first into Asia Minor, where he afterwards fought and conquered Sultan Bayazid, the causes thereof, I say, were these. The lord of the city of Arzinjan was at that time as already explained, the prince Taharten: and his territories neighbored those of the Turk. The Sultan had lately become most avaricious to possess all that region, and more especially to be master of that strong castle of Camag which Taharten jealously guarded as his own. Sultan Bayazid thereupon was prompted to send to Taharten a message demanding of him that he should pay tribute, and also that he should deliver into his care that castle of Camag. To this Taharten replied that willingly would he pay tribute, acknowledging the Sultan as his overlord, but that the Caste of Camag he would not deliver over to the Turks. To Taharten the answer shortly came back that it would be for his peace to deliver it up, otherwise he would certainly lose both it and his whole territory. Now prince Taharten had by this time already heard of Timur and his mighty deeds, and how he was engaged waging war in Persia, where all the Persian princes had been subjugated. Taharten therefore sent envoys to Timur, with gifts and letters, beseeching him that he would

come to his aid against the Turk, and he offered to place both himself and his territories completely at the disposal and service of Timur. Timur on this, despatched an envoy to Sultan Bayazid with letters in which he informed the Sultan that prince Taharten was become his subject and vassal. Hence for his own honor he, Timur, could not allow aught of dishonor to be done to Taharten or the matter should be required at the Sultan's hands.n.l.

Another naxarar response to Mongol control was rebellion and armed resistance. The naxarar rebellions which already have been discussed in different contexts in this study, all were caused by Mongol excesses. Nonetheless, all of them failed because the Mongols controlled the loyalty of certain principal lords who informed on the conspirators. At times, Caucasian revolt amounted to little more than flight far into the inaccessible mountains, but on other occasions, the rebels did have some leverage or at least aid, be it the real or presumed assistance (mostly diplomatic) from the Golden Horde, or be it from alliance with Mongol rebels. The sources contain several instances of such entente cordiale between Caucasian and Mongol rebels². Given the numerical superiority of Mongol troops, and their renowned discipline, and given the mountainous

1
Clav. pp. 131-32.

2
KC pp. 261-62; Mur. p. 133, also KC pp. 297-99; Mur. pp. 164-65.

terrain of Caucasia, such revolts always took the form of guerrilla warfare. It is noteworthy that despite the demonstrated exhaustion of Armenia during the 14th century, there still was some scattered resistance offered to Tīmūr:

...Now a pious tanutēr named Martiros, an extremely strong warrior from the village of Kołb [in northeastern Armenia], mercifull, a lover of the poor, went up onto Bardok mountain which others call T'akalt'u. With him were extremely manly and brave youths from the village. They saved all the Believers through a great battle and with the intrepid aiding power of mighty God, Jesus Christ, our Savior. And though [Timur's men] fought many times, they were unable to take that mountain. But subsequently [Martiros] was murdered by an unclean Turkmen named Sahat' --drowned in the waters of the Araz, far from human sight. 1.

In addition to Kołb, the Prošean city of Sahaponk', and Surmari and Bjni also offered resistance to Tīmūr². Most remarkable of all were the successes of the Georgian monarch against Tīmūr. In the early years of the 15th century, king Giorgi VII undertook a marauding expedition of revenge against Muslim settlements. It was reminiscent of amirspasalar Zak'arē's final campaign

1 TM pp. 17-18. The present writer regrets that he is unable to furnish the classical Armenian texts for TM. So my knowledge there is no copy of Sahnazarean's 1860 edition in the United States. The above passage has been extracted from a full translation of Mecop'ec i's History done by the present writer, during the winter of 1976/77 in Erevan.

2 HAP vol. IV p. 25.

through Naxiĵewan, Juĵa, through Āzarbāiĵān to Mārand, Tabrīz and Qazvīn in 1211-12¹.

Emigration of naxarars from Armenia was caused by two factors: the breakdown of conditions deemed essential by the mecatuns for international trade, and (from the inception of Islamization) anti-Christian terror aimed especially at the prominent and well-to-do. Emigration to escape Mongol domination probably began in the 1220's during the decade of chaos. Already by the time of the French Franciscan William of Rubruck's visit to Ani (1255), even the Zakarids were looking for

¹ "It was about this time [1405/6] that the king of Georgia of whom we have already spoken, came out in rebellion. He invaded the country round and about Ani and Erzerum, which is of Greater Armenia, and extended his raid down even to Tabriz, plundering and burning many villages and hamlets, spreading terror on all hands. The Moslems of Tabriz held that Prince Omar must of his duty march to their defence, but he failed to come. But next he sent in his place, giving him command in Tabriz, a certain great noble [of whom we have already spoken] a very old man, his whose name was Omar Toban, who at the head of some 5,000 horse had hitherto been stationed on the Georgian frontier of those parts. From the country round Tabriz troops were hurriedly collected, these numbering some 15,000 horse, and forthwith proudly marched through the streets of that city, where they made a very fine display. Then these all took their departure for the frontier in the region of the Alataq plains, which are of Greater Armenia. No sooner had king George heard of their approach than he marched out with 5,000 of his horsemen to encounter them; and coming fell on them at night. Taking them thus by surprise, he slew most of these men, while such as escaped fled back to Tabriz, where the terror and confusion of the Moslem folk became very great" (Clav. p. 323).

a way out:

...We came to the country of Sahensa (Šahnšah) once the most powerful Georgian prince, but now tributary to the Tartars, who have destroyed all its fortified places. His father, Zacharias by name, had got this country of the Armenians, for delivering them from the hands of the Saracens.

I took a meal with this Sahensa; and he showed me great politeness, as did his wife and his son called Zacharias, a very fine and prudent young man, who asked me, whether if he should come to you [the Pope], you would keep him with you; for so heavily does he bear the domination of the Tartars, that though he has abundance of all things, he would prefer to wander in foreign lands to bearing their domination. Moreover, they told me that they were sons of the Roman Church; and if the lord Pope would send them some assistance, they would themselves subject all the neighboring countries to the Church. 1.

The sources contain no references to emigration of naxarars and their dependents en masse, of the sort known from earlier times. Nor may much specific be said about emigration in the 13th century generally, beyond the fact that it occurred (and probably was widespread), because of a lack of information. Some 13th century colophons written by clerics from Greater Armenia merely mention the fact that the authors themselves fled from the Mongols, sometimes adding the name of an occasional lord who also left. Cilicia seems to have been a favorite refuge for many Greater Armenians, though colophons written in Armenian centers

1

WR pp. 271-72.

in Italy are not unknown. In the 14th century, the Crimea became a favorite refuge for necatun merchants, and its trading capital of Kafa also became a major center of Armenian culture¹.

Given the inextricable connection between the Church and the State in Armenia, it should come as no surprise that the powerful families diversified their talents and wealth into both areas in the 13-14th centuries. Just as in Arsacid times, in this period also the bishop of a given district usually was the brother or other close relation of the district's secular lord. When a given régime granted the Church tax-free status or other privileges, the secular lords attempted to transfer the family holdings to the (family) Church, to avoid paying taxes, or to obtain other advantages. Each of the major naxarar families groomed certain members (sometimes selected at birth) for specific offices in the Church. Their ideal was the situation obtaining in the late 13th century in Siwnik', ruled by the secular naxarar Elikum Orbélean. The metropolitan of Siwnik' was his brother, Step'annos².

¹ For example: 1233/34 col. Ališan, Hay. #318 "B", p.457; 1238/39 col. Ališan, #318 "C", p.458; 1239/40 col. Yov. Yiğ., pp. 936-37; 1240/41 col. Yov. Yiğ., pp. 941-42, to cite a few of the earlier ones. See T. M. Korkhmazian's Armianskaia miniatiura Kryma [Armenian Miniatures of Crimea] (Erevan, 1978).

²SO pp. 178-79.

With increasing frequency the 13th century inscriptions mention the ~~bestowing~~ of lands and villages on certain monasteries, and virtually all 14th century inscriptions speak of it. The granting of land to the naxararized churches was used as a device not only to avoid onerous land taxes but also as a means of retaining control of the district in the event of the naxarars' departure to another land, temporarily or permanently. The Arcrunids, it will be remembered, had made such an arrangement already in the 11th century when king Senek'erim quit Vaspurakan but retained control of numerous monasteries¹. Over many centuries the Arcrunid Kedenekians and Sefedineans did indeed retain control of some parts of Vaspurakan, especially Ałt'amar where they set up their own kat'olikos- in the early 12th century. It is not impossible that the vardapet Malak'ia of the late 14th century, mentioned by T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, was in eastern Armenia to keep an eye on the property of his prosperous family, which had moved to the Crimea some time before:

...[Malak'ia] was from the seaside city of Erim (Crimea), son of an extremely wealthy family. He left his inheritance and came to the great vardapet Yovhannes. Receiving from him the authority of vardapet, [Malak'ia] went to the district of Naxčuan and constructed Armenian monasteries. 2 .

1 See above pp. 167-68, and Appendix B p. 279.

2 Ibid. p. 15.

The same may be true of Malak'ia's teacher, vardapet Yovhannēs kaxik Orotnec'i, "son of the great prince Iwanē, from the line of the first princes of Siwnik"¹. At the end of our period, the Spanish ambassador Clavijo reported on a similar situation. Enroute to Tīmūr in 1403, Clavijo lodged in the southeastern district of Maku with the Armenian lord of that mountainous area, a Roman Catholic named Nur ad-Dīn:

The governor [Nur ad-Dīn] further had at home there another son, younger than that other, and in conversation he informed us that this second son of his, not being a man of arms like his brother, but learned and a skilled grammarian in the Armenian language, he desired that should God grant us to return home from Samarqand passing by the way of this his castle, he would fain confide this youth to our care, to carry him with us to Spain. Then our King, who, he trusted might favor him, would recommend him to the Pope, beseeching his holiness to ordain him a bishop over his father's province. It is indeed a wonder how the Christians of this Castle of Maku hold their own thus surrounded by the Moslem folk and so far estranged from all Christian succour: they are in fact of the Armenian nation, but of the Roman Catholic belief, and they serve God in the orthodox rite. 2.

The above quotation has elements in common with Rubruck's remarks also. Šahnšah and Nur ad-Dīn both were attempting to ally with the might of the Catholic Church, to bring in a powerful foreign power to give them political

1 TM pp. 14-15.

2 Clav. p. 147.

leverage at home or (perhaps better) to secure the future existence of the family holdings--under control of the clerical rather than secular lords of the family.

With the Islamization of the Mongols, the naxarars were under direct pressure to convert. However, the polygamy of the late 13th century naxarars may indicate that some lords were easing into the Islamic practises of their Mongol overlords even before being obliged to apostasize. Perhaps they practised two religions. Specific references to the conversion of lords in contradistinction to the general conversion of the populace, abound from sources dating to the end of our period. Clavijo and T'ovma Mecop'ec'i both mention the Armenian prince Taharten, governor of Erznjan. His son by a daughter of the emperor of Trebizond, was a Muslim and (perhaps because of his faith), Tīmūr's governor of the same city¹. Another probable Armenian lordly convert to Islam is the emir Ezdin of Van, whom T'ovma Mecop'ec'i described as being "of the line of king Senek'erim", i.e., of some Arcrunid background².

¹ Clav. p. 125.

² TM p. 30.

The Tīmūrīds forced certain princes to convert. Bagarat, king of Georgia, was forced to convert, but the apostasy was only temporary, and to save his life¹. In the late 14th century, Tīmūr's grandson, 'Umar, forced several conversions:

During the first year of his reign, he forcibly made to apostasize three princes of our people who had remained like a tiny cluster of grapes among us: the son of Iwane and grandson of Burt'el, Burt'el ter of Orotan, of the Orbelean family; his brother Smbat whom they took with his family to Samarqand (but subsequently, through divine mercy and their prayers they returned to their patrimony); the ter of Elegis named Tarsayic, son of Gorgon they caused to apostasize; the ter of Maku they detached from the false and diophysitic [beliefs] of Alt'armayut'awn (Roman Catholicism), and the son of an azat (azatordi) named Azitan from Aic'uac' village in the Ayraratean district. Later, however, they repented and became true Believers in Christ and heirs of the Kingdom. 2.

The ter of Maku referred to in the above quotation probably is the first son of Clavijs's host, Nur ad-Dīn. Clavijs related that Nur ad-Dīn came to terms with Tīmūr, and pledged to serve in his army with 20 horsemen³.

1 TM p. 20.

2 TM pp. 67-68.

3 Clav. p. 145. Also see R. Hewsen, "The Meliks"(II), REA #X(1973/74) p. 299.

But this was not enough. Tīmūr demanded religious
adhesion:

Next, Tīmūr, noting that the lord of the castle had so fine a son, it were, he said, indeed a pity the youth should be kept mew'd up at home, and he, Timur, would receive him, carrying him off in his train to become the companion of his grandson. This prince, the grandson of Timur is named Omar Mirza, and he was at that time already established as governor ruling over the whole of Western Persia, in which region Maku is included. The young man whom Timur thus carried off in his train is at this present moment living with Omar Mirza, and has been raised to be a commander in his army. But they have forced him against his will to become a Moslem, having bestowed on him the name of Siurgatmish, and he now is captain of the guards of Omar Mirza. Outwardly he professes himself a Moslem: but not of free will, for at heart he is still a Catholic. 1.

As a result of the unsettled, unsafe times, some lords of completely impregnable fortresses, unable to maintain themselves in any other way, turned to banditry. Prime sources of loot were the increasingly rare caravans passing over the bandit's lands, or even booty captured from Tīmūrīds and Turkmens. Sometimes bandit lords operated alone, sometimes in alliance with others, Christian or Muslim. T'ovma Mecóp'ec'i speaks of one such mixed group of Kurdish Muslim and Armenian Christian brigands from Sasun and Xut' which looted a Tīmūrīd camp

1
Clav. p. 146.

in southwestern Armenia in the early 1390's¹. The Spanish ambassador Clavijo encountered Caucasian bandits both enroute to Erzincan from Trebizond in 1403, and on his return, again in northwestern Armenia and southwestern Georgia: "for though they are Armenians and profess to be Christians, all are robbers and brigands; indeed they forced us, before we were let free to pass, to give a present of our goods as toll for right of passage"². The lord encountered in the Trebizond area in 1403, probably a Graeco-Georgian, was typical of this group of mountain lords:

He proceeded to explain to us that he lived in that barren land, where indeed we found him now at peace, but that he had continually to defend himself against the Turks who were his neighbors on all sides, against whom he was ever at war. Further he said he and his men had nothing to live on, except it were what they could get given them by those who passed through their country, or what they could come to by plundering the lands of their neighbors, and hence he, Cabasica, must now implore of us to give him some aid as a free gift in the form of money or goods. In answer we stated that we were ambassadors and no merchants, being envoys whom our master the King of Spain was sending to the Lord Timur, and that further we carried no goods with us except what we were bearing as gifts to Timur. That Tatar ambassador of Timur, who was our travelling companion, here broke in, saying that though he well knew the Emperor of Trebizond was the overlord of all that country, he was in fact none the less a vassal potentate tributary to Timur, wherefore it was incumbent

¹ TM p. 27.

² Clav. p. 336.

on him, Cabasica, that we all should be allowed to pass those borders without let or hindrance. To this Cabasica, backed by his men, replied that this all might indeed be very true, but that they were in a state only able to exist by what they could obtain in the manner that had been set forth to us; averring that by necessity their stress of wherewithal to eat would cause them even to plunder and raid into the homelands of the Lord Timur himself.

1.

Despite the extremely bleak situation across the Armenian highlands at the end of the 14th century, the sources still report a few instances of secular and clerical Armenian lords enjoying some influence with the Tīmūrīds. Among the secular rulers belong the unnamed woman ruler of Igdīr castle², and the Armenian lord of Bayazīd³. Another such lord was the Roman Catholic Nur ad-Dīn, mentioned earlier⁴. Among the clerical lords enjoying some influence with the Tīmūrīds belong the director of Mecop' monastery, Yovhannēs⁵, and the noted intellectual, vardapet Grigor Tat'ewac'ī, who was a confidant of Tīmūr's son, Mīrān⁶.

1 Clav. p. 119.

2 Clav. 142.

3 Clav. p. 144: "This city was besieged by Timur some six years ago, but the lord of the same shortly came to terms with him agreeing to pay Timur tribute, who on his side promised not to let his Tartars enter the place. Neither was the lord of Bayazid, either of himself or with his men, bound to join and march with Timur".

4 Clav. 145.

5 TM p. 58.

6 TM p. 69.

At the beginning of this chapter it was mentioned that Adontz, Manandyan, and Toumanoff disagreed on the duration of the naxarar "system". Toumanoff placed its destruction in the 11th century, Adontz in the early 13th century and Manandyan, after the mid-14th century, though each of the scholars acknowledged that vestiges of the "system" survived into later times. From the quantitative standpoint, Toumanoff was quite right in placing the beginning of the end in the 11th century. After the Saljuq invasions, the number of remaining naxarar Houses (which had steadily declined from about 50 in the 5th century to 20 ca. 800 A.D.)¹ numbered about five: the Arcrunids, Bagratids, Mamikonids, Orbēleans, and Pahlawunids. From the standpoint of "naxarar ways" which Manandyan spoke of without defining, at the end of the 14th century there were still some "naxarars" alive in Armenia, as this chapter has attempted to demonstrate. Adontz, however, who wrote of a "system" destroyed in the early 13th century was incorrect in his hypothesis. To Adontz, hereditary tenure and seniority were fundamental features of this "system", yet he himself admitted that beginning already in the 5th century, the rule of seniority was being undermined. By the 10th century a fundamental change had occurred in the essence of the "system"². What the Mongol invasions swept away

¹ Toumanoff, Studies, p. 227.

² Adontz, Armenia, p. 221.

was a lordly society, but one more sentimentally reminiscent of, than actually resembling, the Arsacid naxarars so brilliantly described by Adontz.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined various aspects of Armenian history during the 13-14th centuries. Commencing with a review of the Armenian and non-Armenian sources (chapter one), the political and military history of Armenia in our period, and in the period immediately preceding it was presented in chapter two. The third and final chapter concerned Armenia's nobility, the naxarars.

From 1220, when the Mongols first appeared in the Caucasus, to 1385 when Tokhtamysh invaded, a period of 165 years had elapsed. During that time different parts of Armenia had experienced no less than 12 foreign invasions, and the severity of Mongol rule had triggered three Armeno-Georgian rebellions. Mongol centrifugation had resulted in two major uprisings of Mongol nomads resident in the Caucasus itself. Moreover, with the collapse of the Īl-Khānīd state in the 1330's, a condition of "internal war" had existed in most parts of historical Armenia, as mutually antagonistic bands (and armies) of Mongol, Turkmen, and Kurdish nomads fought one another and the sedentary native population. Religious persecution and economic chaos had long since become the norm. In 1386-87, 1394-96, and 1399-1403, Armenia was subjected to what were perhaps the most brutal invasions yet, led or directed by Tīmūr.

By focussing on the information regarding each of the major invasions provided in the Armenian, Georgian, and relevant non-Caucasian sources, the specific features of each have been set forth.

Each successive invasion--Saljuq (11th century, introduced as a prototypical example), Khwārazmian, Mongol and Tīmūrid--pushed before it, brought along with it, or dragged in its wake into Asia Minor, thousands of virtually uncontrollable nomadic warriors who (when totally unchecked) devastated the cities, searching for plunder, destroyed the countryside and the complex irrigation systems, turning cultivated fields into pasturage for their sheep herds, and reduced the possibilities for internal and international trade by infesting the trade routes between cities, and attacking caravans. Following the noted Mongolist, Bertold Spuler, we have described this element as Turkmen, under which is understood not necessarily or solely a Turkic or Turcophone population, but rather that plunder-hungry element among the nomads, in contradistinction to those forces interested in the establishment of stable forms of government, and a sedentary or semi-sedentary existence. Centralizing forces within the various Turco-Mongol societies described, were obliged to support a very delicate balance. On the one hand, the warlike Turkmens were the best, most determined fighters, and so were necessary for victorious expeditions. On the other hand, the Turkmens' impulse to

destroy and move on had to be fought--sometimes literally-- in order for the more sedentary elements to impose taxation on the conquered peoples, and attempt to exploit them in a more systematic fashion. But eventually the Turkmens were victorious, destroying the organized Turkish and Mongol states.

As was pointed out in the final chapter, the wild, unrestrained, plunder-hungry element was present from the very first, during the Mongol invasions and of course during the domination of Armenia (beginning in 1236). In a sense, even the "centralizing elements", or let us say "representatives of the 'central government'" became "Turkmenized". The Mongols did not know the meaning of fair taxation; application of the principle of peaceful exploitation through taxation was not well understood by the rulers of the various nomadic societies, and as a result, conquered countries were squeezed dry of human and material resources. With the Islamization of the Mongols, and the ethnic fusion of Turkic and Mongol groups, all aspects of life became further "Turkmenized". The illegal, extraordinary exactions placed upon taxed communities (reported in the sources almost from the first) were thereby given a religious justification. Once again under the Mongols, as had happened during the invasions of the Saljuqs and the Khwārazmians, fanatical Islam was wed to the nomads'

lust for booty. From toward the end of the 13th century to beyond the end of the 14th century, anti-Christian persecutions prevailed almost uninterruptedly. What earlier had been punishment meted out to an occasionally recalcitrant naxarar became the generalized fate of all Christians refusing to convert. Nomads of all kinds of backgrounds, circulating in different parts of the Armenian highlands, attacked churches, monasteries, wealthy and poor Christians.

During the resurgence and expansion of Georgia in the late 12th and early 13th centuries, the Georgian monarchs used three control mechanisms in dealing with the nobles: (1) manipulation of precedence among the lords and its corollary, the co-optation of allegiance; (2) circumvention of the lords, and (3) de-naxararization. By the end of the 12th century the Georgian Crown had managed temporarily to rein in the most dangerous centrifugal forces--but only for the moment. In that brief historical moment (from the last decades of the 12th century until ca. 1236) Georgian culture flourished and blossomed. Under the aegis of the Georgian Crown and the Armeno-Georgian family of Zak'arean/Mxargrceli, Armenia recovered much of its irredenta, and flourished as a united state.

The nobility of the Zak'arid revival consisted of different elements: men of ambition and military talents from newly-arisen families, who were rewarded by their Zak'arid overlords with grants of land and/or the rights of administration; mecatun merchants; the remnants of the ancient dynastic families: Mamikonids, Bagratids, Arcrunids, Orbēleans, and others, who in the changed situation of the early 13th century all became Zak'arid vassals; and the clerical nobility representing the different Armenian churches.

It must be stated that the Zak'arid revival was of such short duration that the achievement--a centralized Armenian state under Georgian overlordship--is difficult to evaluate. As we illustrated, during the Zak'arid revival and throughout the 13th century there were numerous conflicts among the naxarars (secular and clerical) over land. The lords in this period were not quarreling over more orchards and choice hunting grounds, but over the tolls for right of passage from the trade routes crisscrossing the highlands. There were other superficial similarities with Arsacid naxararism, but we stress that they were more apparent than real. The feud, an important feature of Arsacid naxararism, existed in the 13th century as well, but the obligation of blood vengeance had been

replaced by an elaborate schedule of payments of "blood price" with each class of society having its monetary worth, written into a law code. The old term for the inalienable clan patrimony, the hayrenik', which in Arsacid times had meant land, in the 13th century referred to both moveable and immoveable property, hereditary or purchased, and included money and shares in business enterprises as well. The service obligation of a subordinate to his lord in this period did indeed include military service, but the vassals also paid taxes in cash. Hereditary tenure and seniority were not the main features of this society. Many of the principals of the day were appointees of the Zak'arids, rewarded for their talents. The Zak'arids established marriage ties with the most prominent of the old prestigious families of eastern Armenia. Thus, for a brief moment, it appears that a feudal "command" type of society had been generated--with the principals appointed by the Zak'arids and firmly under their control.

In this connection, it is most interesting to note certain remarks made by Adontz toward the end of his study, as he compared and contrasted his interpretation of the genesis of the naxarars with the legendary account provided by the late 8th century antiquarian, Movsēs Xorenac'i:

...Our own analysis justifies [Xorenac'i's interpretation since it too has shown that the naxarar system did in fact consist first of native [i.e. dynastic] and later of foreign [i.e. Arsacid] elements. The fundamental difference lies in the fact that according to Xorenac'i, the great naxarar-doms were descended from single individuals, while in our analysis they were derived from previously independent ethnic groups.

It is evident from the examples just cited that for Xorenac'i two qualities were the bases of naxarar status: service and nobility, i.e., superiority of blood... In Xorenac'i's opinion, the aristocracy consisted of the more ancient families, primarily those presumably descended from Hayk, which were already present in Armenia at the time of the coming of the Arsacids. According to us, the aristocracy consisted of the houses which had developed through the disintegration of tribal relationships.

For Xorenac'i as for us, land tenure also provided the material basis of the naxarar system. Promotion to the rank of naxarar according to him was nothing more than a grant of lands. Nobility and naxarar status were synonymous concepts for him for the very reason that all nobles possessed lands, and lands were granted in hereditary tenure, n.l.

We maintain that for the early 13th century, both Adontz and Xorenac'i were correct. Zak'arē came very close to Xorenac'i's first Arsacid king, "Vałaršak" in establishing a régime. In a sense, he generated new families through association with his own. But curiously, the tendency toward convergence--mecatuns investing in land, and the remnants of the few ancient dynastic families diversifying into trade--coupled with that strong hereditarizing

1

Adontz, pp. 369-70.

principle which has never ceased to operate in Armenian society--led to a "re-seeding" of what might seem like classical Arsacid naxararism, but in fact was a structure resting on a completely different base. It is very important to underline the fact that in a country with as developed a historical consciousness as Armenia, and as ancient a literature, a certain amount of evocation of the antique past pervades many sources dating from much later times. Just as the Sasanian Persians hearkened back to their Achaemenid "forbears" and adopted certain ceremonial and/or sentimental forms to stress this identification, so too did the Bagratids and Zak'arids look to the Arsacids for symbolic identification. Thus certain similarities of terminology found in Arsacid and Zak'arid sources must be analyzed on an individual basis, before any assumptions of identity may be entertained.

It is important in this regard to note that on the eve of the Turco-Mongol invasions of the 13th century, the term naxarar already designated different types of lords, just as (in a later period) the term melik did. As Hewsen noted:

By the end of the Mongol period, the Caucasian social structure had to all intents and purposes been destroyed in Armenia; its princely houses exterminated,

submerged by the egalitarianism of Islam which recognized no princely dignity, or incorporated into the surviving Caucasian social structure in Georgia. Only here and there, notably in the mountains of Karabagh and Siwnik' some vestiges of the old princely houses survived and retained some measure of local autonomy. This social disintegration is clear from the disappearance of the old Armenian princely titles, so important in the Caucasian social system, and their replacement by one new and flexible term, 'melik', the very all-purposeness of which is an indication that the fixed social framework was no longer there. It would appear then, that the title 'melik' was used simply to designate any of the few surviving members of the Armenian nobility of old who retained any kind of social position in a world which had become the world of Islam; whether one had been a naxarar (dynast) or merely an azat (member of the gentry). Indeed, as we shall see, the term was applicable to municipal ethnarchs and, in time, it would appear, even to mere village chiefs. 1.

We might ask, parenthetically, if indeed even in Arsacid times the term naxarar had a single sense or meaning.

It was pointed out in chapter three that as regards control mechanisms, the Mongols invented nothing new. Furthermore, naxarar reactions to the different control techniques used by the Mongols before and after their Islamization were varied, but also contained no new elements. Naxarar reaction to the invasions was clear: when united military resistance proved impossible, the naxarars holed up in their mountain fortresses; when

1 R. Hewsen, "The Meliks"(I) p. 293.

they learned that the Mongols spared those submitting peaceably, the naxarars submitted, making separate often highly advantageous arrangements with their new overlords. As for the domination, naxarar reactions to Mongol control techniques in the 13-14th centuries may be grouped under five major headings. The lords: (1) attempted when possible to exploit the rivalry between different centers of Mongol authority; (2) rebelled, when feeling themselves sufficiently powerful and when driven to it by Mongol excesses; (3) emigrated from the Armenian highlands in large numbers; (4) Islamized in large numbers, and (5) withstood everything, retaining the Christian faith and also a certain leverage with the Turco-Mongol régimes. Some lords of totally impregnable fortresses became caravan-looters and bandits. Other lords sometimes were able to retain certain privileges and even family lands through the process of giving their lands to religious establishments under the control of clerical representatives of the secular lord's own family.

Robert Bedrosian
Long Branch, New Jersey,
1978

APPENDIX A

Supplementary Notes on the 11-13th Century Naxarars

Aspects of the Saljuq invasions and domination are dealt with in chapter two of this study. Here we shall examine features relating directly to the princes in this period, continuing through to the resurgence of Georgia. Supplementary information on institutions of the Zak'arid period likewise is provided. It should be noted, remarkable as it is, that despite Byzantium's inept and disastrous policies vis-à-vis the Armenians, the Saljuqs did in fact meet some Armenian armed resistance. In 1042, for example, Xul Xaçi Arcruni of T'ofnawan attempted a heroic but futile resistance against 15,000 Turkmens in Vaspurakan. In 1042/43, an unspecified number of Turkmens raiding Bjni in northeastern Armenia were defeated by king Gagik Bagratuni and Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni, son of former sparapet Vasak¹. In 1053 the Armenians of Surmari destroyed an army of 60,000 Turks². The size of Turkmen detachments going against different parts of Armenia varied from about 5,000 to perhaps 50,000 troops. While these armies are not large by modern standards, it must be remembered that the Saljuqs were a determined

1 HAP p. 444.

2 The numbers of combatants, even when given are probably quite inflated. According to Ibn al-Athir, in 1048 a Byzantine army of resistance led by Armenian naxarars in Byzantine service was defeated by the Saljuqs in Basen and prince Liparit Orbelean was captured and taken to Persia

"cohesive" fighting force. The same may not be said of the Armenian and Greek forces of Asia Minor.

During and after the invasions, some princes, not wishing to emigrate, or unable to, took to a wandering life, hiding in caves, in some cases perhaps waiting for opportunities to avenge themselves¹. Others made accommodation with the Saljuqs and retained certain limited rights. Furthermore, the benevolent Saljuq sultan Malik--Shāh granted the Armenian churches tax-free status in 1090, upon the request of the kat'olikos. Probably some of the naxarar families were able to retain control of their lands through the clergy. In the absence of the naxarar confederational State, the naxararized Church became the medium of communication for the families. Indeed Subat Sparapet described kat'olikos Grigor T'ia Pahlawuni (1173-93) as being "like a king" in wealth. References in other sources also suggest a partial restoration of lands and privileges under various Muslim overlords. Matthew of Edessa, for example, describing the situation in the time of Malik Ismael Ibn Yāqūt (1085-93) wrote "everyone ruled his patrimony in his [Yāqūt's] time (amenayn ok' tiral

together with 100,000 captives (HAP pp. 449-50).

1

C.J.F. Dowsett, "The Albanian Chronicle of Mxit'ar Goš" BSOAS vol. 21(1958) p. 484.

ēr hayreneac' iwroc' yawurs nora)". According to Vardan Arewelc'i, when the Shaddādid Manūchihhr ruled Ani-Širak, he recalled from exile Grigor Pahlawuni and restored his holdings¹. Furthermore, Armenians, Greeks and Georgians serving in the armies of the Shāh-Armens and the sultans of Iconium/Konya also received iqtas--originally conditional landholds which quickly became hereditary².

The situation of shock and confusion which many cavalrymen or azats, the "gentry", found themselves in, dispossessed from their lands, was described by the late 11th century author Aristakēs Lastivertc'i: "The cavalry wanders about lordlessly, some in Persia, some in Greece, some in Georgia. The sepuh brigade of azats has left its patrimony and fallen from wealth; they growl wherever they happen to be, like lion cubs in their lairs"³. Members of the azatagundk' hayoc', the cavalry of Armenia, clustered around successful bandits like Goz Vasil or Philaretus

¹ For references and discussion, HAP pp. 497-98.

² HAP pp. 495-96.

³ AL p. 60: "Hece lazōrn antērunč ēr i eal omn i Parss, omn i Yoyns, omn i Virs. Sepuh gundn azatac' eal i hayreneac', ankeal i Coxut' ene, mfnčen ur ew en ibrew zkoriwns afiwuc' i xstis iwreanc'."

Varažnunik' in lands southwest of Armenia. Others found a very warm reception in Georgia. During the reign of David the Restorer (1089-1125), Georgia became a haven for Armenian lords and lordless azats. Matthew of Edessa says that David "received and loved the Armenian people. The remnants of the Armenian forces assembled by him"¹. He also built a special city, Gori, for the refugees: "And he [David] established churches and many monasteries. He named the city Gōfa [Gori] and received all the Armenian people with great joy and gladness"². According to the old medieval Armenian translation of the History of K'art'li ("Juanšēr"), David knew Armenian, and had as his father-confessor the Monophysite vardapet Sarkawag from Halbat monastery³.

1 One of David's wives was Armenian, and his son Demitre was the issue of that union. MEd p. 447: "Af sa žolovec'an mnač'eal zork'in Hayoc'".

2 MEd pp. 447-48: "ew sa šineac' k'ačak' Hayoc' i vašxarhn Vrac', ew hastateac' ekēlec' is ew vanorays basums, ew anuaneac' zanun k'ačak' in Gawray. ew uner mecaw uraxut'eamb ew c'ncut eamb zamenavn azgn Hayoc' "".

3 Juanšēr pp. 122-23: "Furthermore, he wanted to unite the Armenians and Georgians [religiously]. He summoned Yovhannes, kat'olikos of K'art'li, and Arsenios K'art'lec'i, translator of Georgian and Greek, and the bishops and vardapets of Armenia, and held a meeting. They examined [matters] from morning until evening, but did not accept each other".

The emigration of Armenians to Georgia, Cilicia, and other parts of the Middle East led to a phenomenon we might call the internationalization of the great families. There were Georgian Bagratids, Armenian Bagratids, Albanian Bagratids, and Graeco-Saljuq Bagratids, and the same applied to the Arcrunids and Orbeleans. The Pahlawunids in particular internationalized. They were hereditary archbishops of Ani from the 11-13th centuries, and also owned property in Mesopotamia and Cilicia, where in the 12th century they became kat'olikoi. In the 12th century, another branch of the Pahlawunids settled in Egypt and acquired so much influence as veziers, that anti-Armenian riots took place in several Egyptian cities¹. It should be noted, however, that while the internationalization of the great families could and did lead to new trading opportunities and the accumulation of great wealth, such was not always the case. Often the different branches of a given family were in bitter rivalry with each other.

*

In dealing with the Georgian nobility, the Bagratid kings of Georgia utilized many of the same methods as did foreign rulers: circumvention of the dynasts whenever possible,

¹ HAP pp. 516-18, 507, 509-510.

manipulation of the nobles' precedence, and "de-naxarar-ization"--removal of the lords. During the 10-12th centuries, Georgian monarchs attempted to circumvent the autochthonous dynastic nobility by elevating to official positions, persons of non-noble origin. So many non-nobles (uaznoni) were thus elevated to noble status (aznauroba) that in the 11th century Georgian sources a new term, alzebulni ("the raised") appeared to designate this growing body¹. On the military front, the monarchs attempted to circumvent powerful Georgian dynasts by relying on foreign mercenaries (Caucasian mountaineers, Qipchaq Turks,² Russians), the lesser nobility, and the increasingly influential Armenian émigré element. The availability of non-noble and foreign elements probably gave the Georgian Bagratids more leverage in dealing with dynasts than had been the case in Bagratid Armenia.

Apparently Georgian monarchs also were able to manipulate precedence among the nobles more advantageously than their Armenian cousins. Occupancy of the office of commander-in-chief of the army (the amirspasalarate) illustrates this. Throughout much of the 12th century to 1155, the amirspasalars tended to be chosen from the mighty, rebellious Georgian branch of the Orbeleans. In the 1120's the Crown tried

¹ Allen p. 229.

² On the Qipchaqs in Georgia, see M.D. Lordkipanidze, Istoriia Gruzii Xi-nachala XIII veka (Tbilisi, 1974).

to counter Orbēlean influence by advancing the Abulet'isjes; and in the 1130's the Armenian Kiwrikan Bagratids¹. In 1155 king David V tried to check the Orbēleans' power by removing them from the amirspasalarate and giving that office to the Orbēleans' principal Georgian rivals, the Abulet'isjes, to whom other important duties had been given². Orbēleans, however, poisoned the king and regained the office, but after amirspasalar Iwanē Orbēli's abortive revolt in 1176-77, the office was given to a Qipchaq Turk named Qubasar. In 1184, the Gamrekelis were elevated to the amirspasalarate, and several years later the Armenized Kurdish family of Zak'arean/Mxargrceli³. Thus prior to the advent of the Zak'arids, the monarch was able to manipulate precedence by rewarding of office, although from the above it should be clear that the struggle against the dynasts was a continuous ongoing contest. The monarch could never rest or relax vigilance.

1 H.G.Margaryan, "Miifeodalakan payk'are Georgi III-i Zamanak ev K'urd amirapete [The Inter-Feudal Struggle in the Time of Georgi III, and the Amirapet K'urd]", Uraber #11 (1975)p. 50.

2 ibid. p. 49.

3 Allen p. 253.

In the 12th century the Georgian Crown also attempted de-naxararization. This was aimed primarily at the Bagratids' most powerful rivals, the Orbēleans. In 1176-77, the Orbēleans, hoping to seize the throne, rebelled with the support of many Armenian princes (including the Zak'areans, who were Orbēlid vassals at the time)¹. When the rebellion was put down, the entire Orbēlean family (excepting two or three males) was exterminated, and the family assets were confiscated². The Georgian Bagratids also practised a less drastic form of de-naxararization, namely the forcible exile of opponents. In the 11th century, the Georgian Bagratids fought their Armenian Kiwrikan cousins, the "kings" of Lori. According to Kirakos Ganjakec'i:

Kiwrikē Bagratuni, who was from the town of Lori, having opposed the Georgians all his life, kept his patrimony (hayrenik') intact. But after his death [ca. 1090] his sons Dawit' and Abas were deceived by the Georgians and rose and went and received from them as a heritage Tawuš and Macnaberd and other places; then, after some days, the Persians took back Tawuš, and they dwelt in Macnaberd. 3.

1 Margaryan, pp. 51-52.

2 SO pp. 128-35.

3 KG pp. 151-52: "Isk Kiwrikē Bagratuni, or i Lōfē k'atak'i, zamanayn zamanaks iwr kac eal enddem vrac, i hastatut ean paher zhayrenis iwr. Ew yet mahuan nora ordik iwr dawealk' i vrac elealk' i tans hayreneac, gnac in i parsiks, Dawit' ew Abas, ew afnun i noc ane i zarangut' iwn zTawuš ew zMacnaberd ew zavyl tejis. Apa yet awurc' afun darjeal parsikk' i noc ane zTawuš, ew nok' a bnaken i Macnaberd..."

The Armenophile David III who ruled Georgia for less than a year (1155/56-1156/57) "showed such benevolence as to send for the King Kiwrikē, son of King Dawit' Bagratuni, and promise to return to him his patrimony which his ancestors had taken away from him; and thus he sent him back with presents, and arranged a meeting"¹. According to indications in the Albanian Chronicle of Mxit'ar Goš, the Arcrunids who held the position of mayor (amirapet, šahap) of Tiflis and also owned lands at Kayean and Mahkan-berd, were expelled from the kingdom under king Giorgi III (1156/57-1184), though Giorgi's successor T'amar restored them in their holdings².

1 Dowsett, op.cit., p. 488.

2 ibid. pp. 488-89: "When he became king, Giorgi made to seize Prince Vasak, for he bore him a grudge, for when he was governor of the town he did not honour him as much as his brother Dawit' and would not serve and obey him; other rinces of Georgia also speaking ill of him, Vasak fled with his brothers and went to T'iodupolis which is now called the town of Karin [Erzerum]. And the emir named Saltux received him with joy and honor, for when Saltux was captured by the Georgian army whilst he begeided the town of Ani and was brought before King Demetre in Tiflis, Vasak did him many services; because of this, he honored them with gifts and granted them authority over many villages. And having been there for some months, Vasak died and was buried in the church called Astuacacin (Mother of God) in the town. And his standard and clarior and authority were given to his brother called K'urd, and he remained there in great esteem".

As a result of territorial expansion, especially southwest into historical Armenia, the Georgian monarchy had at its disposal an ample fund of land. Choice sites especially in the Armeno-Georgian borderlands were available for gifts to court officials as rewards for military or other services, or to guarantee loyalty. Now the Crown intended such land gifts to be conditional, that is, they were given to a particular individual for the duration of his life or of his tenure. Such was the situation with the district of Lofē and the amirspasalarate. In 1118 Lofē was Orbēlean property. After the dispossession of the Georgian Orbēleans in 1176-77, Lofē was confiscated and given to the amirspasalar Xubasar. When Xubasar was removed from office in 1184, T'amar left him in all of his holdings except Lofē, by now considered the property of the amirspasalar¹. The fact remains, however, that with time, just as appointed offices (such as the amirspasalarate) tended to become hereditary, so did those conditional landholds (such as Lofē) become hereditary within one family (Zak'areans).

1

Margaryan, p. 49. Margaryan notes that Kayean until 1176-77 belonged to prince Hasan, from 1185-91, to Vardan Dadian. After 1191 it belonged to Iwane Zak'arean. He suggests that Kayean went to the holder of the office of msaxurt' -uxuc'es, just as Lore went to the amirspasalar (p. 59).

While the study concerns the 13-14th centuries and not merely the Zak'arid restoration, we feel obliged to make some mention of Zak'arid institutions. These institutions have been examined thoroughly by Babayan, most recently. Regrettably, details are lacking concerning the precise workings of political administration in the immediately pre-Mongol period. The brothers Zak'arē and Iwanē, both notable generals, also held official positions within the Georgian court. Zak'arē was the commander-in-chief of the army (amirspasalar) as of 1191, and the mandaturt'-uxuc'es from 1203 on; while his brother, first the msaxurt'-uxuc'es (foremost vezier at court) became atabeg in 1212, an office which was instituted within the Georgian court at Iwanē's own request¹.

¹ HAP p. 545; S. Erenyan, Amirspasalar Zak'aria Erkavnabazuk (Erevan, 1944) p. 17: mandaturt'-uxuc'es: "vezier of the seal and head of the queen's bodyguard". The following is a partial listing of Zak'arid family titles compiled from inscriptions and colophons.

- d.1212, Zak'arē mand. + amirsp. atabek Iwanē (d.1227)
 1228/29 (son) Sahnsah (d.1261), mand. (son)Awag, amirsp. (VT p.71)
 1230/31 amirsp. (VTpp. 73-74)
 1231/32 amirsp. (VT p. 74)
 1246/47 spasalar (VT p. 90)
 1251/52 amirsp. (CIA v. I p. 15)
 atabek and amirsp. (CIA v.I p. 64).
 1258/59 mand. (VT p. 101)
- 1273/74 atabek+amirsp. paron Sadun (VT p. 115) (d.1284)
 1285/86 spasalar Xarkrceal "son of the great Sahnsah (VT p. 126).
 1291/92 amirsp. Mxargrjel, son of Sahnsah (VT pp. 140-41).
 1300/1 paronut' iwn of atabek amirsp. Sahnsah (CIA v.I p. 68).
 1321 atabek Sahnsah, married to his cousin Xwandze (VT p. 160).
 1336/37 atabek Varham (brother of above), paron of parons (VT pp. .
 1342/43 ¹⁶⁵⁻⁸⁶ patron atabek Varham (VT p. 167).
 1358/59 atabek Zaza (VT pp. 169-70)
 1396/97 in the paronut' iwn of atabek Iwanē (14CC p. 614).

In the view of L. H. Babayan, the nature of the Zak'arid brothers' service to the Georgian Crown was primarily of a military sort. Armenian lands recaptured from the Turks, he suggests, did not pay taxes to Georgia, but to the Zak'arids who sometimes are styled "kings", "Caesars", and "šahnšahs" in the Armenian sources, apparently in recognition of this¹.

Within the vast territories under their jurisdiction the two Zak'arid brothers apparently established many of the same offices as existed in the Georgian Court. The men chosen by them to fill these offices were those same individuals who had been instrumental as warriors in the reconquest of Armenian lands. The service (caḡayut'iwn) tendered the Zak'arids by their appointees consisted of military aid and the payment of taxes. Thus, in return for his service, Zak'arē titled Vače [Vačutean] his "prince of princes"². Members of the Xaçan aristocracy served as Zak'arid heḡubs, chamberlains, court directors, and guardians of Zak'arid children³. Prince Bubak, Iwanē's subordinate, is styled "prince of princes" and "the great

¹ HAP p. 544, VT p. 47; occasionally Zak'arid women are styled queens: VT pp. 71,74; X.pp. 6-7.

² HAP p. 547

³ HAP p. 550.

1

sparapet" in the sources . As Babayan notes, Bubak also was known by the Georgian title of msaxurt'-uxuc'eg--the same title originally held by Iwanē in the Georgian Court².

1
VT p. 51.

2
HAP p. 549. The following is a partial listing of 13-14th century titles mentioned in inscriptions and colophons.

- 1207/8 Vače, "prince of princes" (VT pp. 48,58).
[1217/18] " " (VT p. 61).
- 1210/11 "the great sparapet Bubak" (CIA v. IV p. 69).
1214/15 "the great prince of princes, K'urd" (VT p. 56).
- 1219/20. Vasak Xalbakcan, "kołmnaph(lieutenant)[of the lands]'
1223/24 ~~from Gafni to Barghast~~ (CIA v. III p. 123).
1225/26 "I, Dawit'...atabek of the great and mighty prince Sadun" (VT p. 69).
- 1228/29 hečup Grigor (VT pp. 71-72).
1230/31 K'ap ik...general of amirspasalar Šahnšah (VT pp.73-74).
1232/33 Colophon, Yov.Yiš., pp. 886-87 "prince of princes patron Xawfas".
- 1236/37 Col.Yov.Yiš., pp. 909-911: "prince of princes patron Dawit' Šot [o]f kanc', and his son the brave and renowned patron of patrons Grigor".
- 1243/44 prince of princes K'urd (VT p. 86).
1244/45 ! atabek and amirspasalar Xut'eubul (VT p. 87).
1244/45 K'urd, prince of princes (VT p. 87).
1248/49 Hasan Jalal's wife Mamk'an "daughter of the king of Baik" (VT pp. 92-93).
- 1251/52 "I, Mamk'an, queen, wife of [Hasan]Jalal Dawl[a] (VT p. 96).
- 1251/52 kołmnakal Tarsayıč, prince of princes,... "brother of king Smbat" (VT p. 94).
1252/53 "king Jalal Dawl[a]" (VT p. 96).
1260/61 Smbat "prince of princes" (CIA v. III p. 218 foldout).
1282/83 "the great asparapet Varham" (CIA v. III p. 50; VT pp. 123-24).
- During the 1280's many inscriptions begin using the terms paron and paronut'awn:
- 1289/90 "prince of princes, paron Bult'ay" (CIA v.I p. 22).
1295/96 "prince of princes Burt'el" (VT p. 136).
1296/97 "in the paronut'awn of the prince of princes Grigor" (CIA v. IV p. 355; also VT p. 139).

This lends credence to the view that the Zak'arids created a partial microcosm of the Georgian Court hierarchy on their own lands.

Other important offices (gorcakalut'iwk') fleetingly referred to in the sources are the kołmnakalut'iwk' or lieutenancies. In Zak'arid Armenia there were three of them, held by three major families: in Siwnik', the Orbeleans, in Ayrarat the Vaçuteans, and in Vayoc' Jor the

- 1296/97 Mina khatun, the royal queen, daughter of the great lieutenant of Albania, Jalal (CIA v.III p. 237; VT p. 138).
- 1307 Colophon, 14CC p.42, prince of princes Burt'el.
- 1307 Wife of Hasan the asparapet of Armenia (CIA v.III p.76; VT p. 154).
- 1322 Col.14CC p. 166; "in the generalship and principedom of this district [Glajor] of Burt'el and Amir Hasan".
- 1324 Col. 14CC p. 182, "the king of Georgia and Greater Armenia, Gawrg, the prince of princes of the House of Siwnik', spayapet Burt'el".
- 1337/38 Col.14CC p. 292, "for the paron of parons, Pēšgēn, heir of the royal line of Greater Armenia and his son Blikum, 'born in the purple'".
- 1338/39 Kurd Anberdec'i, prince of princes (VT p. 166).
- 1348/49 Col. 14CC p. 369, "prince of princes Bešken and Ivane", sons of deceased paron Burt'el
- 1341/42 Col. 14CC p. 328: "in the consulship and sparapet-ut'iwk' of Armenia of Biwrt'el [Orbelean].
- 1400/1 Col.14CC p. 632, "the principedom of paron Smbat and Burdel".

Isabakean-Prošians. Babayan reasonably suggests that the kolmnakals were endowed with some administrative-judicial powers¹. The same author believes that the amiras or emirs were city mayors who stood at the head of an elaborate but poorly-understood governing body which included clergy and wealthy laymen. It is clear from inscriptions that at times even the administrative heads of large villages were appointed directly from the top, in one case by Iwanē himself². The sources also contain a welter of terms such as tanutēr, gaherec' iṣṣan, patronac' patron and others, some known from the dawn of Armenian writing, others new. However, the manner in which the real content of such terms changed over time is not clearly known. Often titles such as šahnšah or marzban appear as the given names of individuals who held titled official positions, adding to the confusion³.

1 HAP p. 552.

2 HAP p. 553; VT pp. 50, 52, 68.

3 The following are some random examples of the confusion resulting from the use of titles as proper names.

1206/7 amirspasalar Zak'arē calls himself Zak'arē Šahnšah (VT p. 47).

1208/9 Šahnšah Zak'aria (CIA v.I p. 6; VT p. 49; CIA v.I p. 5; VT p. 49).

1209/10 "in the world reign of the šahnšahs Zak'arē and Iwane" (VT p. 50).

1210/11 Šahnšah Zak'aria (CIA v. I p. 55).

1211/12 Marčan, son of Sargis Hamazaspeanc' (VT p. 52).

1212/13 Šahnšah Zak'aria (VT p. 54).

1215/16 Šahnšah Zak'aria, son of Šahnšah Sargis (CIA v.I p.2).

1220/21 amirspasalar Šahnšah Sargis (meaning Zak'are's son, Šahnšah) (CIA v.I p. 17).

1221/22 I, Marčan, son of Sargis...(VT p. 64).

Furthermore, since the political reality of the time was Armeno-Georgian and not exclusively Armenian, sometimes Georgian titularly is used alongside the Armenian, increasing the confusion¹.

- 1232/33 Col. Yov. Yiš., pp. 886-87, "the Caesars of Armenia Georgia, and all Abxazia".
- 1234/35 "I, T'aguhi, wife of Sarap'sah (VT p. 78).
- 1234/35 "I, T'ayk T'aguhi, daughter of Sarap'sah (VT pp. 78, 112).
- 1243/44 Hasan Jalal's son is named At'abak (VT p. 86).
- 1245/46 "Aslanbeg, son of Marapan" (VT pp. 88-89).
- 1252/53 "I, Smbat, son of Hejub" (VT p. 96).
- 1276/77 At'abak, lord of Kačen (VT p. 118).
- 1281/82 T'aguhi, daughter of the presbyter tēr (lord) Sahak (VT p. 122).
- 1293/94 Hejub's brother's son (VT p. 136).
- 1320 Hečup (CIA v. IV p. 123; VT p. 159).

1

For example:

- 1206/7 amirspasalar Zak'arē calls himself the zawrapet of Armenia and Georgia (VT p. 47).
- 1211/12 Zak'aria "amirspasalar of Armenia and Georgia" (VT p. 53).
- 1214/15 Awag, the "coronant of Georgia" (VT p. 56).
- 1219/20 Iwane, atabek of Armenia and Georgia (VT p. 62).
- 1223/24 "the amirspasalarate of Armenia and Georgia of Sahn̄sah" (VT p. 62).

A classic example of the confusion of Armenian and Georgian titles is the curious and regrettably unique passage in SO p. 100 which mentions the dignitaries summoned by atabek Iwane (ca. 1224) to participate in a judicial decision: "...[Iwane] ordered his grantees to sit and examine the matter: Bubak and the marcuan [proper name or title?], Iwanē the dpel and the memnaššiel [title, or proper name Memna Jaqeli?] the great clawnditel (bishop) who had come from the kingdom, the ciram clawr (abbot) of Varji and the abbot of Panjahank', the great mant'avar (patriarch) of Garšte, the Gageck'ik', and the Macnaberdec'ik' and in addition, many other didebuls: the gadi of Dwin and the one called the šex of Surmari. [Among the examiners were also] the great bishop of Ani, the bishop of Bjni, and the bishop of Harbat". See L. Melik set'-Bek', "A Testimony about the Structure and Procedure of the Supreme Court in Zak'arid Armenia", Telekagir #3-4(1945) pp. 75-79 (in Arm.).

- 1232/33 Col. Yov. Yiš., pp. 886-87: "Now this Bible...was requested by...the honorable prince of princes

Patron Xawfas, son of Amir Sargis, who was the brother of the mother of the Caesars of Armenia, Georgia, and all Abxazia...the great Zak'are and Iwane...before whom he was nourished and grew up...After great Zak'are's untimely passing to Christ--which plunged the land of Armenia into darkness--his well-favored descendant...the mandatort'axuc'es of the great kingdom, Sahnšah, succeeded to the throne of his father's kingdom...May Jesug Christ keep him in peace...and also keep his son Zak'are 'born into the crown' (t'agacin)...The same loyalty was shown by the very honorable prince of princes Xawfas educating and nourishing him with all piety and devoutness as he had been educated by his forbears--from whom as recompense for his loyal service, he received a great honor [of the office] of msaxurt'axuc'es in Georgian which translates into our [Armenian] language as 'chief and commander of all the rulers and chiefs of the royal house of his lord' (glux išxec'ol ew hramanatar amenayn išxec'olac'ew glxawor-ac tan t'agaworut ean teafn iwroy)".

APPENDIX B

Aspects of Centrifugalism within and among Certain 13-14th Century Naxarardoms

The 13th and 14th centuries were characterized by conflicts within and among certain Caucasian naxarardoms. In some cases these conflicts pertained to families (e.g., the Georgian Bagratids, the Zak'arean/Mxargrcelis, the Kaxaberijes of Rača, the Orbelean/Orbelis, the Arcruni/Mahkanaberdelis, the Jaqelis), in other cases, to the "naxarardoms" of the Church(es). The conflict within the Georgian royal family was extremely serious and must be mentioned not only as an example of centrifugalism at the very pinnacle of authority in Christian Caucasia, but also because of its devisive ramifications. On his deathbed, king Giorgi Laša Bagratuni (d. 1223) was promised by his sister Rusudan that Giorgi's child son David Lašaeon would receive the throne on his maturity. Rusudan (d. ca. 1245) then became "king" of Georgia. Rather than honoring the pledge made to her late brother, Rusudan instead banished and imprisoned David Lašaeon and enthroned her own son (also named David). While co-optation of the heir hardly was a new feature in Georgia, its almost inevitable result was the polarization of the nobility into two hostile camps. Eventually the authority of the "usurper" David Rusudanean was challenged by the matured embittered David Lašaeon. Between 1250 and 1258, Georgia thus had two kings simultaneously. The line of David Lašaeon occupied the throne in Tiflis until 1289, but from

1291 to 1318 a system of collegial sovereignty existed in Georgia whereby Lašaeen kings were forced to share the realm with co-kings--their very sons, or candidates from the rival line of David Rusudanean¹.

Hostile relations among prominent families had at their base disputes over land. From the order of Kirakos Ganjakec'i's narration, one might (incorrectly) assume that the amirspasalar Awag Zak'arean was the first Armenian prince to surrender to the Mongols (1236) and consequently his holdings were not disturbed by the conquerors². However, Kirakos' junior contemporary, Step'annos Orbelean, placed the submission of Elikum Orbelean before that of Awag³, and the point is revealing and crucial. For the Armenian Orbeleans, prior to the

1
C. Toumanoff, "The Fifteenth Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia", Traditio VII (1949-51) pp. 204-5, 210.

2
KG pp. 255-56.

3
SO pp. 149-50: "...Taking [Elikum] as a guide [the Mongols' commander Aslan-novyn] went as far as Ani, subduing everyone. He took Vayoc' Jor and Elegis as far as Ereror village which stands opposite Gafni, and gave it all to Elikum, saying: 'That which was taken by the sword and that which was bought with gold are equally the patrimony of man. Now these districts which I have taken with my sword shall be yours as patrimony and the patrimony of your line. Do you now faithfully look upon us and serve the Great Khan who sent us here'. And Elikum with great heartfelt thanks served them. From that day forth it was confirmed that those [lands] would be the patrimony of the Orbelean tun(House) and line. Now other commanders subordinated other lands and brought out of Kayen fortress, Awag. They took the

invasions, had been clients of the Iwanē-Awagids, yet from Step'annos' account it appears that the Orbēleans (with Mongol approval) had expanded their holdings at Awagid expense, at the time of the conquest itself. Enmity over the Orbēlan expansion may have accounted for Elikum's death, as Step'annos suggested¹, and enmity marked Zak'arid-Orbēlean relations for some decades to follow. Elikum was succeeded by his polyglot brother Smbat.

...But after Elikum['g death] the tun(House) of Awag treated the Orbelean tun with great jealousy, and enmity especially Awag's wife. They wanted to disperse and persecute the, or to destroy the surviving children, Smbat and his brothers. They [the Awagids] seized their patrimony while [the Orbeleans] wandered about in concealment, here and there until the compassionate love of the Creator willed to restore and strengthen the Orbelean tun through Smbat... .2.

The significance of the underlined "especially Awag's wife" appears to have escaped modern scholars. Curiously, it appears that the line of Gonc'a, daughter of the duke Kaxaberi of Rač , descended from a Georgian branch of the Orbēleans³. Consequently, Gonc'a's enmity toward

kingdom of Georgia by force, and absolutely ruled everywhere" (SO pp. 149-50).

1

SO p. 150 suggests that Elikum was murdered by physicians at the command of Awag.

2

SO p. 151.

3

Toumanoff, Studies, p. 211 n. 238.

Smbat may have had elements of an intra-family feud. It is interesting too (and similarly unremarked by scholars) that the Awagid-Orbēlean land dispute resulting from the Mongol conquest has been carried over into the sources more than once, and in more than one way. For example, in relating one and the same story--how Smbat Orbēlean aided a fugitive monarch--Step'annos Orbēlean mentions the incident as occurring on Smbat's land, whereas the History of K'art'li describes the same territory as "the land of atabek Awag"¹.

The importance and severity of the [Kaxiberije]-Awagid--Orbēlean feud led Smbat to the Far East on two occasions, for protection and confirmation of "his lands". The first visit(ca. 1252) resulted in Smbat's vindication². But the

1
SO pp. 152-53; KC p. 228; Mur. p. 103.

2
SO p. 157: "They gave him a golden p'aviza which is a tablet bearing the names of God and of the king, their greatest honor. They also drew up a yarligh (eaflex) which we call sigel--a command--and gave him all that Aslan had taken by the sword and Orotn with its lands...and the gortress of Borotn with its provisions, as the blood--price for the murder of his father Liparit. Furthermore they removed Smbat['s name] from the dawt'ars of the Georgians and others. This was the second confirmation of their patrimony, for the first [time] it was taken by th sword, when [Smbat] was a servant, by the agency of Aslan--noyin; while the second time [it was received] as a gift from the Khan..."

Awagids were unwilling to accept this verdict, and plotted to destroy Smbat:

Now while these [events] were so [unfolding] that wicked Satan started stirring up envy and inciting the tun of Awag and the Georgian grandees [against Smbat]. Awag had died in the year 1250/51 (699 A.E.). His wife had a daughter named Xořak', and ruled all of his principedom. They assembled in Tiflis near Arghun, for the great Khan had designated him vezler and paslaz (overseer) over all the lands, i.e., commander of all and ruler of the royal taxes and the great diwan. [It was he] who made a census of all the lands in 1254/55 (703 A.E.). With numerous bribes they requested Smbat's destruction and that he not be able to hereditarily transmit his country. Arghun did not dare accede to this request, but he did take away from Smbat many places, and severely oppressed the remainder. 1.

Smbat made a second journey to the Far East ca. 1257, and had his rights reconfirmed². Meanwhile Gonc'a Kaxiberije-Awagean had married the Georgian king, David Lařaean.

1

SO p. 159: "Isk minč iys avspēs linēr, ada bariateac'n satanay sksaw naxani ārkanel, ew grērel ztunn Awagin ew zmecamecan Vrac. ew zi Awagn vaxcaneal, er i 699 t uin ew kin nora Gonc'avn uner dustr me Xořak'anon. ew is-xer amenavn isxanut ean nora. yasn orov zołovec an i Tr is at Arghun or er vazir ew pasla (tesuř) kargeal i mec anen i veray amenavn asxarhis, avsink n pramanatar amenec un ew isxec oā ark uni harkac n ew mec diwanin, or arar asxarhagir zasxarhs amenavn y703 t uakanin: Ew bazum kasafok xndrein korusanel zSmpat ew oř zafangec uc nel zerkir nora, zor ew oř hamariaker Arghun, ayl afin i Smbatay bazum teis. ew zmnac'ealsn kelek'-ein pastkapes".

2

SO p. 161.

The birth of their son Demitre created a Bagratid-Kaxaberije-Awagean link. The struggle of families was by no means over, however:

...Now Smbat planned, with the other princes to become the "adopted father" of Awag's tun; by order of Hülegü-Khan they had Gonc'a drowned in the sea, and he, Smbat, ruled over all of Awag's principdom. He gave Awag's daughter Koşak in marriage to the great sahipdiwan Xoja [brother of the historian Juvayni]...This occurred in 1269/70 (718 A.E.). 1.

According to Step'annos, the Georgian monarch David Laşaeen and Smbat were on the best of terms: "King David so loved Smbat that he considered him his equal, and placed the little boy Demitre in his hands, giving his son to him"². Once again the enmity of families has left

1

SO p. 165: "Isk Smbatav hayragir leal tann Awagin' xorhi end ayl isxanac n. ew tan spananel, i covamili zGonc ayn, hramanaw Hulawu lanin. ew ink n isxer amen-ayn isxanut eanc Awagin. Ew tay zdustr nora zKosak n i knut iwn mec Xo javin sahip diwanin...ew er ays y718 t'uin". KC p. 251; Mur. p. 123: "Now Awag's former wife, the queen Gonc'a, was killed when located among the Tatars, as they say; and it was at the urging of her daughter Koşak, wife of the sahibdivan khaja Shams--ad Din that she was killed".

2

SO p. 168.

its imprint in the literary sources, creating a contradiction. According to the History of K'art'li, it was to Sadun Arcruni, not to his rival Smbat, that Xořak' and care for the Awagid holdings were entrusted¹. Nor does the same work dwell on the close relations between the king and Smbat².

Allegedly Smbat extracted a concession from king David. He convinced the king to destroy a document relating to the time of the expulsion of the Orbēlis from Georgia (because of their involvement in the abortive rebellion of 1176/77). Whether the Armenian Orbēleans were able to reclaim the old family possessions in Georgia is unclear from the sources, though Smbat's "exceeding delight" at

1

KC p. 238; Mur. p. 110: "At that time, Awag was dead, having left no male heir, but only a daughter named Xořak'. In tears the king went to Bjni. He saw Awag's fair wife, Gonc'a, the daughter of Kaxaberije, duke (erist'av) of Rač. He fell in love with her and after a short while, married her and made her queen. He brought her to his kingdom. As for Awag's daughter, he left her in her patrimonial holdings and entrusted her to Sadun Mahkan-berdeli".

2

KC p. 237; Mur. p. 109-110: "The fact that Gonc'a had become queen was displeasing to the mestumre Jik'uri, since they were enemies. So on the advice of Smbat Orbeli [word] was spread about that Jik'uri had sent someone to Arghun to reveal to Hūlegū-Khan the [size of the] king's wealth, and his intention to rebel".

the king's action, reminiscent of Elikum's "heartfelt thanks" to Aslan noyin strongly suggests that some partial restitution was made to the Orbēleans¹.

1

SO pp. 168-69: "Then the king called Smbat to Tiflis and wanted to show his gratitude to him through very great gifts. He asked Smbat: 'What great gifts shall I bestow upon you? For whatever in my kingdom you wish, whatever you find agreeable, I shall give you unsparingly'. Smbat arose and prostrated himself: 'Oh king, whatever we have is/was [given by] you and your forbears. This much is enough for us; but there is one thing I request from you'. The king responded: 'I swear that I shall give you whatever you ask for'. Smbat said: 'Then obliterate that wicked memory of us, through which your forbear, [ing] Georgi slandered my ancestors. For he had written [a document] with curses, such that we not be allowed into our patrimony, and he had it placed in his treasury. Give that [document] to me'. The king was astonished and despised his father for removing from his tun such powerful and capable men. And he ordered his attendants to search for and bring that document (girk: "writing, letter, book"). They went, located it, and quickly brought it. The king took it in his hand and stood up, saying: 'Behold, Smbat, take the document you requested'. Smbat arose, prostrated himself, and replied: 'Oh king, who so forgave the past, show me [yet another] kindness. That book was written by a king's hand; it must be destroyed by a king's hand. Order that a fire be kindled before yourself, and throw that book into the flames with your own hand'. At once the king commanded that a fire be struck up. He pulled out his sword, tore out the pages, and threw them into the fire. Whereupon Smbat was exceedingly delighted and thanked him. After this, the king gave him many other magnificent gifts and robes of honor and further distinguished him and sent him home. In this manner did Smbat remove the stigma attached to his ancestors, and left a good reputation for those succeeding [him]".

According to Step'annos, the preeminence of Orbēleans in Caucasian affairs continued after Smbat "passed from this world in a chariot of angels"--probably murdered while in Tabrīz (1274)¹. Smbat's heir, his younger brother Tarsayiġ supposedly enthroned Demitre "with great effort" as king of Georgia². But the History of K'art'li describes matters differently. Sadun Arcruni's great influence is noted, while Tarsayiġ Orbēlean is not even mentioned:

During this period Sadun Mahkanaberdeli had become stronger than all his contemporary princes, since Abaqa liked him. And [Sadun] started to be caretaker of all Georgia's affairs, because [the king] had entrusted [to his care] lord atabek Awag's daughter, while Koġak' had given him the eġibdom.

Then all the gidebuls of Georgia assembled and took the royal Demitre to the Horde. They went to Sahnšah's son, Iwane, the mandat'urt'--uxuc'es, and he too went to the Horde where they saw to it that Demitre received the reign... [Abaqa-Khan] gave the entire kingdom to him, excepting [the lands of] Sargis Jaqeli. He sent him back to Sadun whom king Demitre made atabek. 3.

¹ SO p. 166.

² SO p. 171: "bazum ġaniw".

³ KC pp. 269-70; Mur. p. 150.

According to the History of K'art'li, Sadun was made atabek by the new Georgian monarch, and upon his death (d. 1281/82) his son Xut'lubula Arcruni received Sadun's property and the office of spaspeti¹. Step'annos Orbēlean wrote the following:

...[Arghun-Khān] liked king Demitre greatly. He gave Demitre the entire land of Armenia, the tun (House) of Awag and the tun of Sahnšah and of the Gagec'ik' and the sons of atabek Sadun...

...Then Demitre returned [to the Caucasus] with great joy and all the azats and grandees of Georgia and Armenia with him. When he reached Sarur, Tarsayič came before him and magnified the king with great honor and royal gifts. [Demitre] took him to his Awagean country, Ayrarat, and greatly entreating him, forced him to be atabek over his entire lordship, from Tiflis to Ani and Kars. He also entrusted Tarsayič with his young sons, Dawit' and Manuel whom he raised and kept. Thereafter Tarsayič held the atabekate of the land of Armenia and did many things to lighten[the lot of] the harassed Armenian people... 2.

King Demitre "sent his little son David to the house of atabek Awag so that he would grow up there and have a

1 KC p. 281; Mur. p. 150.

2 According to the History of K'art'li, the property of atabek Awag, before being entrusted to king Demitre "belonged to the sahipdiwan", i.e., to Shams ad-Din Juvaini (KC p. 285; Mur. p. 153). SO pp. 172-73: "Ew er end nora t'agaworn Demetre, zor sireac' Arlunn, ew et nma zamenavn asxarhis Hayoc' ztunn Awagean ew ztunn Sahansahban ew Gagec' in ew zordisn Sadun at abekin... Apa darjaw Demetre mecaw xndut eamb ew amenavn azatok', ew mecameck' Vrac' ew Hayoc' end nma. Ew ekeal i Sarur' gnac' nma end afa' Tarsayičn mecamec patuov, ew ark unakan ançaviwk' mecareac' zt' agaworn. Ew na afeal taraw end iwr zna verkirn Awagean vAyrarat, ew bazum i axanianok' bñaz-boseac' zna, ew ed At' abek iveray amenavn terut' ean iwroy minçew i Tp' is ew vAni ew i Kars. Ew ed i lers nora ztlayn iwr zDawit' ew zManueln anuc' anel znosa ew pahel, ew vavnmhete uner Tarsayičn zat' abekut' iwn asxarhis Hayoc', ew bazum diwrut' iwn ew olormut' iwn atner ne' eal azgis Hayoc' ..."

share in the property of the royal line"¹. The Orbēleans are not mentioned here. The sources themselves are in conflict over who was the more important naxarar in this period, but what is important here is the evidence of conflict among the families. Indeed, within the Orbēlean family itself quarrels arose among the children of Tarsayiĉ after his death (1290)².

Conflicts among the secular lordly families were paralleled by conflicts among the clerical nobility. As the history of the Armenian Church in this period has been studied in elaborate detail in Ormanian's Azgapatum, here we shall note only some of the major divisions which led to unlimited conflict and rivalry. First, there were religious differences within the two branches of the Zak'arid family itself. Though Zak'arē remained true to Armenian Monophysitism, his brother Iwanē "converted" to Georgian Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. Nor was Iwanē an exceptional case. Many Armenians,

1
KC p. 285; Mur. p.153.

2
SO pp. 177-78: "...But then his sons commenced arguing over their father's lordships and principedom. They went to the royal court and stood before the ruler Arghun-Khan and familiarized him with their debate. Arghun called forth the senior son, Elikum, appointed him to his father's place and set him as prince over all. However, although Elikum ruled all of his father's patrimonies and principedom, nonetheless he did not want to deprive his brothers. So he divided the entire inheritance with the advice of the bishops, vardapets and azats. He gave a suitable portion to his brother's son, Liparit...".

especially those living and working in Georgia or in the Armeno-Georgian borderlands had come under the influence of Chalcedonianism. These Armenian Chalcedonians performed the Greek rite in the Armenian language. The sources contain frequent allusions to rancor and enmity between Armenian Monophysites and Armenian Chalcedonians¹. The disputes occasionally took the form of land disputes between monasteries².

Second, Roman Catholicism began to have an impact on Armenian religious affairs. In the 13th century, for complicated reasons, the Cilician Armenian monarchy and kat'olikosate and certain circles in Greater Armenia began encouraging the idea of religious union with Rome³.

1 VA p. 143; Zak'arē and Iwanē attempted to forcibly unite the Armenian Monophysite and the Georgian Chalcedonian Churches, unsuccessfully (KG pp. 166-67; the Annals of Bishop Step'annos, MC vol. 1 p. 38). The center of Georgian Chalcedonianism in northern Armenia was the monastery of Pñjahank', on which see P.M. Muradyan, "Vrac'eren arjanagrut'yunner Hayastanum: Pñjahank'" [Georgian inscriptions in Armenia: Pñjahank'] "Traber #1 (1973) pp. 39-57, as well as the same author's first article, "Georgian inscriptions in Armenia" describing the inscriptions at Hnevank', Sanahin, and Halbat, Telekagir #3 (1966) pp. 30-47.

2 KG p. 222.

3 G. Petrowicz, "Miabanoł ełbayrnere ew Hay ekelec'in [The Uniators and the Armenian Church]", HA (1969) pp. 361-62.

In 1316 at the Council of Adana, union was made¹. But although a number of vardapets and bishops agreed to union, others rejected Latinophile policies outright²: During the tenure as kat'olikos of Yakob Ssec'i (1327--41, 1355-59), Sis and Eĵmiacin broke over the issue³. But by that time the Dominicans had won over to Catholicism the influential Yovhannēs K'fneç'i of southern Siwnik', who began attracting to Catholicism his former fellow classmates⁴. The fight against the Armenian Catholics of K'fna preoccupied the Armenian Church leadership for much of the 14th century. During the reign of Yakob Ssec'i, matters had deteriorated to the point that the Cilician kat'olikos supported K'fna's efforts against Eĵmiacin⁵.

1
Petrowicz pp. 363-64.

2
As Petrowicz notes, the signatures of those favoring unity, appearing on the protocols of the Council of Adana, indicate support from numerous parts of Armenia: (all bishops) Vardan of Ani, Yovhannes Maranduneanc', Yovhannēs of Taron, Markos of Karaç, Yakob of Salmast, Grigor of Maraš, Nerses of Kamax, Awetik' of Np'rkert, Vardan of Sasun, P'ilippos of Xofjean, Step'annos of Colonean (HA p. 367).

3
Petrowicz pp. 364-65.

4
ibid. pp. 367-68.

5
ibid. pp. 466-67.

A third source of conflict came from the very existence of the kat'olikosate (or anti-kat'olikosate) of Ałt'amar. The kat'olikosate and its jurisdiction were denounced and "nullified" by the kat'olikosate of Sis in the early 12th century, but this did not put an end to Ałt'amar's independent development¹. Kat'olikos Grigor Anawarzec'i (1293-1307) attempted, unsuccessfully, to bring Ałt'amar into allegiance with Sis and Ĕjmiacin². In 1408/9 the noted cleric and scholar Grigor Tat'ewac'i removed his diocese of K'aĵberunik' from communion with Ałt'amar, but the general anathema imposed on the kat'olikoi of Ałt'amar remained in effect until 1441³. The kat'olikosate of Ałt'amar continued its existence until 1895⁴.

1 Akinean, "Ałt'amar" , HA (1916) pp. 141-42, (1917/18) p. 34.

2 ibid. (1916) p. 142.

3 ibid. pp. 144-45.

4 ibid. p. 148. Yet another special "center" of the Church was the district of Siwnik' in eastern Armenia, an area traditionally known for its separatist tendencies. The political independence of Siwnik' in this period was paralleled by jurisdictional independence in religious matters. Thus the historian Step'annos Orbelean was ordained in Cilicia in 1287/88, "metropolitan of the great see of Siwnik'", above all the other bishops here and there, some in Vayoc' Jor and some in Tat'ew" (SO p. 174). To my knowledge, Step'annos was the first cleric in Armenia to be styled metropolitan, a new term perhaps to match Siwnik's unique position (VT p. 137, also CIA v. II p. 78). In any case the erudite Step'annos appears to have maintained good relations with Sis and with the clerical nobility of Greater Armenia. It is known, for example, that Step'annos was a close friend of kat'olikos Zak'aria I of Ałt'amar (1296--1336) and requested from him a copy of T'ovma Arcruni's History of the Arcrunid House (10th cent.) [TA p. 319]. For

Given the numerous sources of conflict, within and among families, and within and among religious institutions, the foreign rulers of Armenia in the 13-14th centuries did not have great difficulty keeping the naxarars divided--it was the natural state of affairs.

the most part, however, relations among the various Armenian Christian groups--just as relations among the important secular naxarardoms--were characterized by bitter conflict and rivalry.

APPENDIX C

Notes on the Relations between the Mongols and the
Armenian Church in the 13th Century

1. Philo-Christianity and Taxation of the Church

During the 13th century, the presence of numerous Christian Mongols in the Mongol court and army had many different ramifications. General statements to the effect that the Mongols were philo-Christian or that the Church and its hierarchy were not taxed during the domination are misleadingly inaccurate. While specific Mongols were philo-Christian, and though churches under the jurisdiction of certain naxarar families were not always taxed, the situation changed from ruler to ruler.

The earliest information on relations between the Mongols and the Armenian Church is found in Kirakos Ganjakec'i's History and relates to the first appearance of the Mongols in the Caucasus, ca. 1220/21:

...False information came concerning them to the effect that they were mages and/or of the Christian faith--wonder-words--and that they had come to avenge the Christians from the tyranny of the Tačiks. And it was said that they had with them a portable tent-church and a miracle-working cross and that they would bring and throw an eph of barley before this cross and all the soldiers would take from it, and give it to their horses and the supply would not be exhausted...Such false rumors filled the land. Therefore the inhabitants of the country did not fortify themselves

in, to the point that one lay presbyter, taking his people, even went before [the Tatars] carrying [in procession] hooded crosses. The enemy put them to the sword, one and all. 1.

The Mongols' motives in this instance, during their reconnaissance mission of 1220/21 simply may have been to terrorize the population. However it is not impossible that the unfortunate Christian welcoming party was mistaken for a band of secular princes. According to Kirakos Ganjakec'i, when in 1236 the Mongols returned to the Caucasus and in subduing the region captured the great cleric and scholar Vanakan vardapet, they thought that he was a secular prince and pressed him for information about fortresses and the whereabouts of the Armenian lords². In any case, in 1236 the Mongols did not exterminate the intellectuals who had fallen into their hands. Vanakan,

1
 KG p. 202: "Ew hambaw stut'ean gayr znoc'anē, t'ē mogk' en ew k_ristoneayk' hawatov, ew nsanagorck', ew ekeal en i vrezxndrut' iwn k_ristoneic', or i bñnut' enen tačkac'. Ew aseın, t'ē unin ekelec' i vraneay ew xač sk' ančelagorc ew bereal kapič mē gari arkanen afaıi xačın, ew amenavn zork' n afeal i nwane tanin tan erivanac' iwreanc', ew nē pakasi, ayl ibrew spatın amenek ean i taneloy, novncap' kapičn anden mnay... Ew avspisi hambaw stut'ean ic' aw vasxarha. Yasn avsorik nē amrac an bnakičk' asxarhin, mičew erēc mi asxarhakan afeal zōkovurd iwr, ew xačiwk' vateloyk' ent ac' aw end afaıi noc' a. Ew noc' a sur i veray edeal kotorec in znosa at basarak...".

² KG p. 246.

his student Kirakos, and many other clerics were forced to serve the Mongols as secretaries, "writing and reading letters"¹.

A definite improvement in conditions for Christians of the Mongol Middle East was achieved by the Syrian doctor of the Church, Rabban in 1241/42². Thanks to

1
 KG p. 249: "Apā afin ew zis synkerac' imoc' zkni iwreanc' i pets dprut ean grei t' uit ew ent' efnul...".

2
 KG pp. 276-77: "...He was known as the 'father of the Khan', since in Syriac rabān means vardapet, while in Mongolian at'a means father. As soon as he heard about the merciless killing of the Christians occasioned by the Tatar troops, he approached the Khan and beseeched him for a letter to give the Tatar troops, commanding them not to kill innocent people the way they were doing, people who had not warred against them, but instead [the Mongols should] let them alone so that they might serve the king. With great pomp the Khan sent Raban himself to his commanders with a written order that all obey his command.

"When Raban arrived, many things turned propitious for the Christians and the killings and captures ceased. He likewise built churches in Tačik cities where previously no one dared utter the name of Christ--even in Tabriz and the city of Maxčawan which were yet more inimical to the Christians, so much so that Christians [dwelling there] did not dare appear or walk abroad openly, to say nothing of constructing a church or erecting a cross. Yet Raban erected cross and church, and the sounding-board was heard day and night. Christians openly took their dead for burial, carrying [in the procession] hooded crosses, gospels, and worshipping after the Christian custom. Those opposing them were put to death. No one dared come out against [Raban's] order. On the contrary, the Tatar army revered him like their king, and without Raban, they neither planned nor did anything...And those merchants who had his tamgha that is to say, insignia, boldly circulated throughout the lands and no one dared approach those who mentioned Raban's name. Instead all the Tatar commanders gave him gifts from their booty".

Raban's efforts, Nersēs, kat'olikos of Caucasian Albania was taken to Chormaghun's wife, Altana:

...They gave [Nersēs] gifts and an al-tamgha, so that no one would harass him, [and] they gave him a Molal Tatar guide who took him throughout his dioceses in Albania. For a long while neither [Nersēs] nor his predecessors had dared to circulate throughout the dioceses due to the blood-thirsty and bestial nation of Tačika. Now [Nersēs] passed throughout his dioceses, returning peacefully to his residence in Xamši monastery... 1.

In 1247/48, the kat'olikos Kostandin of Cilicia sent to Greater Armenia gifts and money for the embellishment of the monastery of St. T'adeōs, which was then elevated to a diocese. This renovation work was entrusted to a vardapet Yovsēp' and was expedited by the Mongols:

And Yovsēp' went to a Tatar commander named Angurak noyin whose summer quarters were close by the tomb of the blessed apostle T'adeos. And on his command, Yovsēp' blessed the church and held the pre-consecration ceremony, built a monastery and assembled many clerics in it.

The Tatar man enlarged the roads on all sides [so that] all pilgrims could come amongst his troops fearlessly. He commanded strictly that no one wishing to come be harassed, and he humbled himself to them with love. And many of them came and baptized their sons and daughters, and many who

1

KG pp. 291-92: "...Etun nma pargews ew ēltamlays, zi mi' ok' nelesc' ē zna, etun nma molal t'at'ar afajnord, or tareal srjeal oyc, zna yašxarhn Atuanic i vičak iwr, zi yčloy zamanakk ein, or oč na ew oč ork' yafa] k'an zna, oč isxein srjil end vičakeals iwreanc' yašags ariwnarbu ew gazanabaroy azgin tačkak'. Isk nora srjeal end vičak-ealsn darjaw andren xalatut' eamb i tei iwr, i vansn Xamši".

were possessed by devils and were sick became healed, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ was glorified. 1.

To my knowledge, the implications of certain statements in the sources concerning the tax status of the Armenian churches have not been thoroughly understood. According to Step'annos Orbēlean, prior to Smbat Orbēlean's visit to the Far East in 1252/53, the churches of Orbēlean Siwnik' were being taxed "bitterly"². In Mōnge-Khān's

1

KG pp. 311-12: "Ew Yovsep'ay ext'eal af zōraglux mi T'at'arin, orum anun er Anagurak-nuin, oroy liawank n iwr yawursn amaraynoy hup er i gerezman surb afak'elovn T'adeosi, ew nora hramanaw srbeal sekelec in ew nawakatis katareal sineac zvanen ew zoloveac i na kronawors bazums.
Ew avr T'at'ar endarjakeac' zcanaparhs yamenavn koimanc anerkiw gal uxtakanac n end mel zorac nora, patuer hramani tueal sastkut eamb mi zok, zzucl ew netel, or kamic in gal, ew ink n sirov xonarher af nosa. Ew bazumk' i noc unc gavin ew mkrtein zusters ew zdusters iwreanc' ew bazum aysahark' ew hiwandk' bzskain. ew p'afawor liner anun tearn meroy Yisusi K'ristosi".

2

SO p. 154.

presence, Smbat complained about the harassment of the churches¹, and received from MÖngke "a decree freeing all the churches of Armenia and the priests", a statement repeated twice². With encouragement from Baiju's wife, Smbat rennovated Siwnik's religious seat Tat'ew (then in a dilapidated condition)³. Kirakos and the History of K'art'li very clearly state that as a result of emir Arghun's census of 1255, neither Church nor clergy was to be taxed⁴. However, in 1257 when Hasan Jalal visited Batu-Khān in the North, he pointed out that Nersēs, kat'olikos of Albania still was being harassed. He was given a written order that such harassment should stop⁵.

1
SO p. 155.

2
SO p. 157: "Ew hraman eaf azatel samenayn ekelec'is Hayoc' ew zk'ahanays"; SO p. 158: "Ew azateac zekelec'is ew zk'ahanays ziwroy isxanut'eann ew amenayn asxarhis Hayoc'."

3
SO p. 158.

4
KG p. 363; "This [emir] Arghun designated what was proper [for tax collection] in all four Khanates, for he was a just man, But as for monks, friars, and Church foundations, he did not place them under taxation, nor the balan [tax] either. The same went for sheikhs and dervishes. He freed [from taxation] all those Believers called the Servants of God" (KC p. 235; Mur. p. 108).

5
KG p. 359: "...[Hasan] also received a document guarenteeing freedom for lord Nersēs, kat'olikos of Albania, for all his properties and goods, that he be free and untaxed and allowed to travel freely everywhere in the dioceses under his authority, and that no one disobey what he said".

The fact that Hasan, subsequently "being harassed by tax-collectors and by [emir] Arghun"¹ was obliged to visit the Far East to complain, demonstrates the crucial point, and is equally valid for the secular Hasan and the clerical Nersēs. It was not enough simply to have written patents of authority or protection. The local Mongol noyins did not always implement them.

In the late 1270's according to the History of K'art'li, the twelve retreats of Garesja, Georgia were taxed by the Mongols--even though under the administration of so loyal a Mongol supporter as Sadun Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli². In the early 1280's (and presumably before), more than 150 Armenian monasteries within the Georgian state were being taxed³. Consequently we must conclude that even before the Islamization of the Mongols, many Armenian churches were taxed.

1 KG p. 359: "Neleal i harkapahanjac'n ew yArġunēn".

2 KC p. 272; Mur. p. 142.

3 SO p. 173: "Thereafter Tarsayiĉ [Orbēlean] held the stabeate of the land of Armenia, and did many things to lighten[the lot of] the harassed Armenian people. Going to Tiflis he had brought forth the royal diwan and read all the names of the Armenian monasteries, and such remained in the diwan as taxable (i nerk'oy harki). So he had fetched the senior ciknawpar of the archives and changed the dawt'ar. He removed the names of more than 150 monasteries. [from the tax-register] and burned the old [register] in the fire. Thus did he free all the churches".

2. Armenian Clerical Presence at the Courts of the Khāns

William of Rubruck and Het'um the Historian provide valuable information regarding Armenian clerics in Asia and about Armenian Christian influence on the Khāns. Rubruck who travelled to the Far East during 1253-55 found Armenian priests at virtually all the major stopping places. At the very start of his trip, in Constantinople he met and conversed with Armenian merchants and resident clerics¹. At Sarai on the Volga river, the capital of the Northern Tatars, he encountered at the court of Sartakh-Khān (Batu's son) "Armenian priests who knew Turkish and Arabic" and were employed as translators in addition to performing religious duties². Armenian priests were serving as translators in Qara Qorum, Mongolia also as William subsequently discovered³.

In Qara Qorum, Rubruck came upon a small Armenian chapel. Its colorful attendant was the "monk" Sargis. This

¹ WR p. xxxvii.

² WR p. 105.

³ WR pp. 166, 205.

impostor claimed that:

...he had been a hermit in the country of Jerusalem, and that God had appeared to him three times, enjoining on him to go to the Prince of the Tartars. But as he neglected going, God threatened him the third time, striking him down to the ground, and saying that he should die if he did not go; and that he should say to Mōngke--Khan that if he would become a Christian, all the world would come under his rule, and that the great Pope would obey him... 1.

Sargis indeed was an Armenian, "swarthy and lank"², but not a priest; and, if a Christian, of a rather shamanistic sort³:

...but he lied, for he had taken no [religious] orders, and did not know a single letter, but was a cloth weaver, as I found out in his own country, which I went through on my way back. 4.

Although William does not mention other Armenian clerics by names, he does alude to their presence. Thus, worried

1
WR p. 169.

2
WR p. 168.

3
WR pp. 193-96, 203-205, 207, 211, 218-19.

4
WR p. 193.

that the Pope's letters he was carrying may have been tampered with, he wrote:

...I feared that as those who had interpreted your letters were Armenians from Greater Armenia--great haters of the Saracens --they had perhaps through hatred and for the discomfiture of the Saracens, gratuitously translated as had suited their fancy. 1.

Furthermore, Rubruck's comment that Armenian Easter was celebrated in Qara Qorum with a large clerical procession to the Khān's residence, only makes sense if there were a sizeable number of Armenian clerics present².

While in Qara Qorum, William encountered an unnamed Armenian lordly petitioner to Mōngke-Khān:

A certain Armenian who had come with the monk had brought this said cross from Jerusalem, as he said, and it was of silver, weighing perhaps four marks, and had four gems in the angles and one in the center; and it did not have the image of the Savior, for the Armenians and Nestorians are ashamed to show the Christ fixed to the Cross. And they had presented it to Mōngke-Khān, and Mōngke asked him what he wanted. Then he said he was the son of an Armenian priest, whose church had been destroyed by the Saracens, and he asked his help to restore this church. Then [Mōngke] asked him with how much it could be rebuilt, and he said two hundred iascot--that is two thousand marks. And he ordered that he should be given letters to him who receives the tribute in Persia and Greater Armenia, to pay him this sum of silver. 3.

1
WR p. 166.

2
WR p. 187.

3
WR p.191.

In my opinion, the lord mentioned above probably was Smbat Orbēlean, whose first trip to the Far East took place while Whilliam was in Qara Qorum.

Het'um the Historian's History provides an account of Armenian Christian influence in the courts of various Mongol Khāns. Evidently, some of his information is fanciful or perhaps even wishful thinking. However, the unmistakable import of his narration is that Armenian Christians enjoyed considerable influence with different Khāns. Supposedly, when king Het'um of Cilicia visited Mōngke-Khān in the early 1250's:

...First he urged the Khān to convert to Christianity and to accept baptism together with his people; second, that eternal peace and friendship be established between Christians and Tatars; third, that it be possible to construct Christian churches in all of the Tatar countries and that the Armenians be freed from taxes and other burders; fourth, that the Holy Land and the Holy Sepulcher be wrested from the Turks and given to the Christians; fifth, that the caliph in Baghdad, the head of the [Muslim] religion, be done away with...When the Tatar Khān had consulted with his princes and grandees, he replied to the king of Armenia: 'I accept your requests. I shall accept baptism and adopt the Christian religion and show concern that all my subjects do likewise... 1.

1
Het'um p. 45.

Chapter 24 of the History is entitled "Regarding the Baptism of Mōngke-Khān" :

Now after Mōngke had accepted the requests of the Armenian king with charitable munificence, he had himself baptised by the chancellor of the Armenian kingdom, who was a bishop. Whith him [were baptised] his house and numerous other esteemed and grand men and women. 1.

The Cilician king Kewon (like all the Cilician kings) is elevated in Het'um's account to the position of defender of the Christians. When visiting Abaqa-Khān in Iran:

...the king of Armenia beseeched him regarding freeing the Holy Land from the infidels. And Abaqa so promised, simultaneously advising the Armenian king to send emissaries to the Pope and to the orthodox kings [regarding this matter]. 2.

Thus we may conclude that an Armenian clerical presence existed at the courts of the Khāns already by the early 1250's, and probably earlier. It may have developed into a sizeable presence before the Islamization of the Mongols in the late 13-early 14th centuries, involving clerics both from Greater Armenia and Cilicia. The influence of Christian Cilician kings with the Khāns ended with Mongol Islamization.

1
Het'um p. 46.

2
Het'um p. 57.

Bibliography

I. Sources

AL

Aristakēs Lastivertc' i, Patmut' iwn Aristakisi Lastivertc' woy [History of Aristakes Lastivertc' i], K. N. Yuzbašyan, ed. (Erevan, 1963).

Trans. : Récit des malheurs de la nation arménienne, M. Canard et H. Berbérian, trad. (Bruxelles, 1973).

Povestvovanie vardapeta Aristakēsa Lastiverttisi, K.N. Yuzbašyan, trans. (Moscow, 1968).

BH, Chronicon Syriacum

Bar Hebraeus, The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj... Bar Hebraeus, E.A.W. Budge, trans. (London, 1976) reprint of the 1932 edition.

CIA

Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum [Divan Hay Vimagrut' yan]
Vol. 1: H.A. Orbell, ed. (Erevan, 1966).

Vol. 2: S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1960).

Vol. 3: S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1967).

Vol. 4: S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1973).

Vol. 6: S.A. Avagyan and H.M. Janpoladyan, ed. (Erevan, 1977).

Clav.

Clavijo, Embassy to Tamerlane 1403--1406, G. Le Strange, trans. (London, 1928).

Dawit' of Ganjak

The Penitential of Dawit' of Ganjak, C.J.F. Dowsett, ed. (Louvain, 1961).

GA

Grigor Aknerc'i, History of the Nation of the Archers (the Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc'...the Armenian text edited with an English trans. by Robert P. Blake and R.N. Frye Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies #3-4(1949) pp. 269-443; printed as a separate book with the same title (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

Trans. : Istoriia Mongolov inoka Magakii [Malak'ia the Monk's History of the Mongols], K. Patkanov, trans., (St. Petersburg, 1871).

Ouvrage de Malakia-Abégha, ou Malakia-le-Moine, in Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Georgie, M. Brosset, trans. (St. Petersburg, 1851).

Galstyan, A.G.

Armianskie istochniki o Mongolakh [Armenian Sources on the Mongols], A.G. Galstyan, trans., (Moscow, 1962).

Hayoc' nor vkanera, 1155-1843

Hayoc' nor vkanera, 1155-1843 [Armenian Neo-martyrs, ANM], Y. Manandean, Hr. Ačarean, ed. (Vałarsapat, 1903).

Het'um

Het'um the Historian, Het'um patmič T'at'arac' [Het'um, Historian of the Tatars], M. Awgerean, trans. (Venice, 1842).

Ibn al-Athir

Ibn al-Athir, "Fragments de Géographes et d'Historiens arabes et persans inédit", M. Defremery, trans. JA #13(1848), #14(1849).

Ibn Battuta

Ibn Battuta, The Travels of Ibn Battuta, H.A.R. Gibb, trans. vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1962).

- Ibn Bibi Ibn Bibi, Die Seltchukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi Munksgaard (Kopenhagen, 1959).
- Trans. of passages relevant to Armenia: "Hayaстан Ibn Bibi Hamemat [Armenia According to Ibn Bibi] P. Ter-Polosean, trans., HA (1960):
- Juanšēr Juanšēr, Harafōt Patmut'awn Vrac' encaveal Juanseri patmiči [Concise History of Georgia Presented by Juanser the Historian], (Venice, 1884).
- Juvaini Juvaini, The History of the World--Conqueror, J. A.Boyle, trans. vol. 1 (Manchester, 1958).
- KC K'art'lis C'xovreba [The History of K'art'li], S. Qauxçilāvili, ed. vol. II (Tbilisi, 1959).
- Trans. : K'art'lis C'xovreba, text and French translation by M. Brosset in Histoire de la Géorgie, depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIX siècle (St. Petersburg, 1849).
- Vrac' Žamanakagrut'yun (1207-1318) [The Georgian Chronicle], P. Muradyan, trans., (Erevan, 1971).
- KG Kirakoš Ganjakec'i, Patmut'awn Hayoc' [History of Armenia], K.A. Melik'-Ohanjanyan, ed. (Erevan, 1961).
- Trans.: "Histoire d'Arménie par le vartabied Kirakoš de Gantzac", Deux historiens arméniens, M.F. Brosset trans. (St. Petersburg, 1870).
- Istoria Armenii [History of Armenia] L.A. Xanlarian, trans. (Moscow, 1976).

- MC Manr Zamanakagrut'yunner XIII-XVIIIdd.
[Minor Chronicles of the XIII-XVIII
Centuries], V.A. Hakobyan, ed.
vol. 1 (Erevan, 1951),
vol. 2 (Erevan, 1956).
- MEd Matthew of Edessa, Patmut'iwn
Matt'eosi Ufhayec woy[History of
Matthew of Edessa], (Jerusalem,
1869).

Trans.: Bibliothèque historique
arménienne, I, E. Dulaurier, trans.
(Paris, 1858).
- Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i, Histoire
chronologique Mkhithar d'Airivank
M. Brosset, trans. (St. Petersburg,
1869).
- Mxit'ar Goš Mxit'ar Goš, "The Albanian Chronicle
of Mxit'ar Goš", C.J.F. Dowsett,
trans. BSOAS #21 (1958).

Afakk'[Fables], (Venice, 1854).

Girk', datastani [Law Book],
X. T'orosyan, ed. (Erevan, 1975).
- Q Qazvini, The Geographical Part
of the Nuzhat-al-Qulub of Hamd-Allah
Mustawfi of Qazvin, G. Le Strange,
trans. (London, 1919).
- Rashid al-Dīn Rashid al-Dīn, The Successors of
Genghis Khan, J.A. Boyle, trans.
(New York, 1971).

Sbornik letopisei[Collection of
Chronicles], A.K. Arends, trans.
(Moscow-Leningrad, 1946).
- SA Samuēl of Ani, Samuēli k'ahanayi
Anec'woy hawak munk' i groc' patmagrac'
[Samuel the Priest of Ani's Collection
of Historians' Writings], A. Ter--
Mik'elian, ed. (Vałarsapat, 1893).

Trans. : Collection d'historiens arméniens, M. Brosset, trans., vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1876).

Schiltberger

Johann Schiltberger, The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, J.B. Telfer, trans. (London, 1879).

Smbat Sparapet

Smpat Sparapet, Smbatay Sparapeti taregirk' [Chronicle of Smbat Sparapet], S. Agelean, ed. (Venice, 1956).

SO

Step'annos Orbelean, Patmut'iwn nahangin Sisakan arareal Step annosi Orbelean ark'episkoposi Siwneac' [History of the State of Sisakan by Step'annos Orbelean, Archbishop of Siwnik'], K. Sahnazareanc, ed. (Paris, 1859).

Trans. : Histoire de la Siounie, M. Brosset, trans. 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1864-66).

Spuler, Bertold

History of the Mongols Based on Eastern and Western Accounts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, translated from the German by H. and S. Drummond (Berkeley, 1972).

TA

T'ovma Arcruni, T'ovmayi vardapeti Arcrunwoy Patmut'iwn tann Arcruneac' [Vardapet T'ovma Arcruni's History of the Arcrunid House], (St. Petersburg, 1887).

TM

T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, Patmut'iwn Lank-T'amuray ew yaJordac' iwroc' arareal T'ovma vardapeti Mecop'ec'woy [The History of Tamerlane and His Successors by Vardapet T'ovma Mecop'ec'i], K. Sahnazarean, ed. (Paris, 1860).

- Trans. : Exposé des guerres de Tamerlan et de Schah-Rokh dans l'Asie occidentale, d'après la chronique armenienne inédite de Thomas de Medzoph, Felix Neve, trans. (Brussels, 1861).
- TM, col. T'ovma Mecop'ec'u višatakarane [T'ovma Mecop'ec'i's Colophon]
K. Kostanean, ed. (Tiflis, 1892).
- VA, Geog. Vardan Arewelc'i, Ašxarhac'oyc' Vardanay Vardapeti [Geography of Vardan Vardapet], H. Berberian, ed. (Paris, 1960).
- VA, Hist. Vardan Arewelc'i, Hawak'umn patmut'ean Vardanay vardapeti lusabaneal [Compilation of History by Vardapet Vardan Arewelc'i]
(Venice, 1862).
- VT Vimakan taregir [Annal of Inscriptions], K. Kostanean, ed. (St. Petersburg, 1913).
- WR William of Rubruck, The Journey of William of Rubruck, W. Rockhill, trans. (London, 1900).
- Xaçikyan, L. 14CC, XIV Dari hayeren jefagreri hišatakaranner [Colophons of XIVth Century Armenian Manuscripts], L. Xaçikyan, ed., (Erevan, 1950).
- 15CC, XV Dari hayeren jefagreri hišatakaranner [Colophons of XVth Century Armenian Manuscripts], L. Xaçikyan, ed., vol. I (1401--1450), (Erevan, 1955).
- Yaquṭ Yaquṭ al-Hamavi. Passages relevant to Armenia and neighboring areas have been drawn from the Armenian translation in Arabakan, pp. 5-121.
- Yov. Yiš. Yišatakarank' jefagrac' [Manuscript Colophons], G. Yovsepean, ed. (Antilias, 1951).

II. Literature

- Abelyan, M., Erker [Works] vol. 4 (Erevan, 1970) reprint of Hayoc hin grakanut'yan patmut'yun [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] vol. 2 (Erevan, 1946).
- Abrahamyan, "Ruk'n-ed-Dini partut'yune [The Defeat of Rukn al-Din]", Telemekir #5-6 (1941).
- Adontz, N.A., Armenia in the Period of Justinian, N.G. Garsoian, translator and editor (Lisbon, 1970) originally published in Russian in 1908.
- Akinean, N., "Akanc' kam Akneri vank'e [Akanc' or Akner Monastery]", HA (1948).
- "Ait'amaray kat'olikosac' gawazanagirk'e [The Succession of the Kat'olikoi of Ait'amar]" HA (1916).
- "Grigor k'ahanay Aknerc'i patmagir T'at'arac' Patmut'iwn 1250-1335 [Grigor the Priest of Akner, Historian of the History of the T'at'ars]", HA (1948).
- Review of R.Blake's History of the Nation of the Archers HA (1955).
- Review of Kirakos Ganjakec'i (Tiflis, 1909), HA (1910).
- Review of L. Xaçikyan's 14CC, HA (1951).
- Ališan, L., Hayapatum [Antiquities], (Venice, 1901).
- Sirak (Venice, 1890).
- Sisakan (Venice, 1893).
- Ali-zade, A.A., Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaja i politicheskaja istoriia Azerbaidzhana XIII-XIV vv [The Socio-Economic and Political History of Azerbaijan in the XIII-XIV Centuries], (Baku, 1956).

- Allen, W.E.D., A History of the Georgian People (New York, 1971) reprint of the 1932 edition.
- Anasyan, H.S., Haykakan matenagitut'yun [Armenian Bibliography] vol. 1 (Erevan, 1959).
- Afak'elyan, B.N., "Aprank'ayin artadrut'yan ev arhestagorcut'yan texnikavi zargac ume havastanum IX-XIII darerum [Commodity Production and the Development of Craft Technology in Armenia in the IX-XIII Centuries]", PBH #2-3 (1959).
- "Hayastani miĭnadaryan k'alak'neri bnakçut'yan soc'ial-akan kazme [The Social Composition of Medieval Armenian Cities]", PBH #2 (1958).
- "Mecatunneri k'alak'ayin vernaxavi jevavorume [Formation of the Mecatun Urban Upper Stratum]", HAP ch. 34.
- Avagyan, S.A., "Tanutrut'iwn" termine Ani XI dari arjan-agrut'yan mej [The Term "Tanutrut'iwn" in an Xith Century Inscription from Ani]", PBH #2 (1971).
- Avdalbegyan, T., "Haykakan arjanagrut'yunneri mej mi galnik' ev nra nšanagrut'yune Hayastani 13-14rd dareri ntėsanakan patmut'yan hamar [A Secret in the Armenian Inscriptions and Its Significance for the Economic History of Armenia in the 13-14th Centuries]", Teĭekagir #2 (1927).
- Babayan, L.H., Aknarkner miĭnadaryan havastani patmut'yunic [Episodes from the History of Medieval Armenia] (Erevan, 1966).
- "Hayastane Hulavyan iřxanut'yan tirapetut'yan nerk'o [Armenia under Rŭlegŭid Domination]", HAP ch. 37.
- "Hayastane monçolakan tirapetut'yan araĭin řrjanum [Armenia in the First Period of the Mongol Domination]", HAP ch. 36.
- "Monçolakan arřavank' nere ev Hayastani nvaçume [The Mongol Invasions and the Conquest of Armenia]", HAP ch.35.

- Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaja i politicheskaja istorija Armenii v XIII-XIV vekakh [The Socio-Economic and Political History of Armenia in the XIII-XIVth Centuries], (Moscow, 1969).
- "Zak'aryan erek' iŝxanut'yunneri kazmavorume [The Formation of the Three Zak'arid Principalities]", HAP ch.32.
- Baldasaryan, E. M., "Erznkayi haykakan iŝxanut'yune XIII-XV darrerum [The Armenian Principality of Erzinjan in the XIII-XV Centuries]", Lraber #2 (1970).
- Bart'ikyan, H. M., "Hayastane Byuzandakan tirapetut'yan nerk'o, kronakan k'alak akanut'yune [Armenia under Byzantine Domination, the Religious Policy] HAP ch. 25.
- Barxutareanc', M., Arc'ax (Baku, 1895).
- Barxutaryan, S., "Mi k'ani ditolut'yunner Erevani Kat'olike ekelec'u arjanagrut'yan veraberyal [A Few Observations on the Inscription of Erevan's Cathedral Church]", Telekagir #5 (1947).
- Bausani, A., "Religion under the Mongols", SMP ch. 7.
- Berberian, H., "Le Patriarcat arménien du sultanat de Roum", REA, n.s. #3(1966).
- Bofnazyan, S.V., "Hayastani nvačume seljuk-t'urk'eri kołmic' [The Conquest of Armenia by the Saljuq Turks]", HAP ch. 26.
- "Salduxyannere Karinum [The Saltukids in Karin]", HAP ch.28.
- "Soc'ial-intesakan haraberut'yunnere kilikyan haykakan petut'yunum [Socio-Economic Relations in the Cilician Armenian State], (Erevan, 1973).
- Boyle, J.A., ed., The Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 5, the Saljuq and Mongol Periods (Cambridge, 1968)[SMP].
- "The Journey of Het'um I, King of Little Armenia, to the Court of the Great Khan Mōngke", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964).

- "Kirakos of Ganjak on the Mongols", Central Asiatic Journal #8 (1963).
- Budge, E.A. Wallis, The Monks of Kublai Khan (London, 1928).
- Çamçean, M., Patmut'awn Hayoc' skzbanē ašxarhi minčew zam teafn 1784 est awandeloj aylayl matenagrac [History of the Armenians from the Creation of the World to A.D. 1784 According to the Accounts of Diverse Sources] 3 vol. (Venice, 1784-86).
- Cahen, Cl., Pre-Ottoman Turkey (London, 1968).
- "Une campagne du seldjukide Alp-Arslan en Géorgie", Bedi Karthlisa 41-42 n.s. XIII-XIV (1962).
- Canard, M., "La campagne arménienne du sultan Saljuquide Alp Arslan et la prise d'Ani en 1064", REA, n.s.(1965).
- Charanis, P., The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire (Lisbon, 1963).
- Cleaves, F.W., "The Mongolian Names and Terms in the History of the Nation of the Archers by Grigor of Akanc'", Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies #3-4 (1949).
- Der Nersessian, S., Armenia and the Byzantine Empire (Cambridge, Mass., 1945).
- The Armenians (New York, 1970).
- Eremyan, S., Amirspasalar Zak'aria Erkaynabazuk [Amirspasalar Zak'aria Mxargrceli], (Erevan, 1944).
- "Liparit zoravari haĵordnere ev Danišmanyan tohmi caĵman xndire [The Successors of General Liparit and the Problem of the Origin of the Danishmandid Line]", Telekagir #8 (1947).

- Galstyan, A.G., "The Conquest of Armenia by the Mongol Armies", Armenian Review #27 (1975).
- "The First Armeno-Mongol Negotiations", Armenian Review #29 (1976).
- Garscian, N. G., "Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia", HA (1976).
- Grigoryan, G.M., "Dramakan haraberut'yunneri zargac'ume Syunik'um ev St. Orbelyani harkac'uc'aki xndire [The Development of Money Relationships in Siwnik' and the Question of St. Orbelean's Tax List]", Lraber #2 (1966).
- "Step'anos Orbelyan", PBH #4(1976).
- Hakobyan, T'.X., Havastani patmakan asxarhagrut'yun [Armenia's Historical Geography], (Erevan, 1968).
- Step'anos Orbelyan (Erevan, 1960).
- Syunik'i t'agavorut'yune [The Kingdom of Siwnik'] (Erevan, 1966).
- Harut'yunyan, B., "Feod-in ev beneficium-in hamaspatasxanol terminnere hay mi'nadaryan grakanut'van mej [Terms Corresponding to Feod and Beneficium in Medieval Armenian Literature]", Lraber #12 (1958).
- Hewsen, R., "The Meliks of Eastern Armenia", REA article I IX(1972), II X(1973/74), III XI(1975/76).
- Hovhannisyan, A., Drvagner hay azatagrakan mtk'i patmut'van vol. 1 [Episodes from the History of Armenian Liberational Thought], (Erevan, 1957).
- Huart, C., A History of Arabic Literature (New York, 1903).

- Husseinov, R., "La conquête de l'Azerbaïdjan par les Seldjucides", Bedi Karthlisa 48-49 vol. XIX-XX (1965).
- Iakanyan, V.K., "Arcrunyac' artagalt'i masin [On the Arcrunid Emigration]", PBH #3 (1965).
- Jalalean, S., Çanaparhordut' iwn i mecn Hayastan [Journey to Greater Armenia] I(Tiflis, 1842), II(Tiflis, 1858).
- Kazhdan, A.P., Armiane v sostave gospodstvuiushchego klassa Vizantii v XI-XII vv. [Armenians in the Composition of the Ruling Class of Byzantium in the XI-XII Centuries], (Moscow, 1975).
- Kirakosyan, G.E., "Matenagitakan telekut'yunner Dop'yanneri masin [Bibliographical Information on the Dop'eans]", PBH #1 (1969).
- Korkhmazian, E. M., Armianskaia miniatiura Kryma [Armenian Miniatures of Crimea], (Erevan, 1978).
- Kurdian, H., "Mamikoneanneri Dseî Çule[The Dseî Branch of the Mamikoneans]", Bazmaver (1956).
- Lafadaryan, K., "Patmahagitakan ditotut'yunner nor Berdi Kyurikyanneri isxanut'yan masin [Historiographical Observations on the Kiwrikan Principality of Nor Berd]", Telekagir #4-5 (1940).
- Lalayan, E., "Sisian", Azgagrakan Handes (1899).
- "Ganjaki gawaf [The District of Ganjak]", Azgagrakan Handes (1899).
- Laurent, M.J., "Byzane et Antioche sous le curopalate Philarète", REA IX (1929).
- Le Strange, G., Mesopotamia and Persia under the Mongols in the Fourteenth Century A.D. (London, 1903).
- Ligeti, L. "Le Lexique mongol de Kirakos de Gandzak", Acta Orientalia Hungarica, XVIII (1965).
- Lordkipanidze, M.D., Istoriia gruzii Xi-nachala XIII beka [The History of Georgia from the Xth to the beginning of the XIII Century], (Tbilisi, 1974).

- Manandyan, H.A., Feodalizme hin Hayastanum [Feudalism in Ancient Armenia], (Erevan, 1934).
- K'nnakan tesut'yun Hay žolovrdi patmut'yan [Critical Survey of the History of the Armenian People], vol.3 (Erevan, 1952).
- The Trade and Cities of Armenia in Connection with Ancient World Trade, N.G.Garsoian, trans. (Lisbon, 1965).
- Margaryan, H.G., "Mižfeodalakan payk'ara Georgi III-i žamanak ev K'urd amirapete [The Inter-Feudal Struggle in the Time of Georgi III, and the Amirapet K'urd]", Lraber #11 (1975).
- Marr, N. Ia., "Arkaun, mongol'skoe nazvanie khristian[Arkaun, the Mongolian Designation for Christians]", Vizantiisk-i Vremenik XII(1905).
- Massé, H., "Le sultan seldjoukide Keykobod Ier et l'Arménie", REA IX(1929).
- Mélikoff, I., "Géorgiens et Arméniens dans la littérature épique des Turcs d'Anatolie", Bedi Karthlisa 36-37 n.s. XI-XII (1961).
- La Geste de Melik Danismend (Paris, 1960).
- Melik'set'-Bek, L., "Geragovn datarani ev datavarut'yan masin Zak'arean Hayastanum [On the Supreme Court and Legal Proceedings in Zak'arid Armenia]", Telekagir #3-4(1945).
- Vrac' albyurnere Hayastani ev hayeri masin [Georgian Sources on Armenia and on the Armenians], vol. A (Erevan, 1934), vol. B (Erevan, 1936).
- Mikaelian, G.G., Istoriia Kilikiiskogo Armianskogo gosudarstva [History of the Cilician Armenian State], (Erevan, 1952).
- Minorsky, V., Studies in Caucasian History (London, 1953).

- Moule, A.C., Christians in China before 1550 (New York, 1930).
- Movsesian, L., "Histoire des rois Kurikian de Lori", P. Macler, trans., REA (1927).
- Muradyan, P.M., "Vrac'eren arjanagrut'yunner Hayastanum Pinjahank' [Georgian Inscriptions in Armenia: Pinjahank'J]", Uraber #1 (1973).
- Mušeian, X.A., "Dramayin šrjanafut'yune Hayastanum IX-XIV darrerum [The Circulation of Money in Armenia in the IX-XIVth Centuries]", PBH #4(1971).
- Orbeli, I.A., "h'Asan Dzhahalal kniaz' Khachenskiĭ [Hasan Jalal, Prince of Kaçen]", Izvestiia imp. AN (1909).
- Oskanyan, A.M., "Ašxaragrakan determinizme hay patmagrut'yan meĭ [Geographical Determinism in Armenian Historiography]", PBH #2 (1960).
- Oskean, H., "Kirakos Ganjakec'i", HA (1922).
- "Vardan Arewelc'i", HA (1921).
- Perikhanyan, A., "Drevnearmijskie vostaniki [The ostanik's in Ancient Armenia]", VDI #2 (1956).
- Petoyan, V., "Sasuni T'ofnikyan išanut'yune [The T'ofnikean Principality of Sasun]", Telekagir #2 (1955).
- Petrowicz, G., "Miabanoĭ eĭbayrnere ew Hay ekelec'in [The Uniators and the Armenian Church]", HA (1969).
- P'irialēmean, L., Notark' hayoc' (Constantinople, 1888).
- Sahinyan, A., "Mamikonyan-Hamazaspyan tohme Hayastanum XII-XIII darrerum [The Mamikonean-Hamazaspean Clan of Northern Armenia in the XII-XIII Centuries]", Uraber #3 (1968).

- Sahnazarean, A., "Zak'arean tohmi caguma [Origin of the Zak'arid Clan]", Soġakat (Vatarsapat, 1913).
- Sanjian, A.K., Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts 1301-1480 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).
- Saunders, J.J., "The Decline and Fall of Christianity in Medieval Asia", Journal of Religious History #2(1968).
- The History of the Mongol Conquests (London, 1971).
- Spuler, B., The Muslim World, part II, The Mongol Period (Leiden, 1960).
- Sruanjteanc', G., T'oros Aġbar: Hayastani Ćambord [Brother T'oros, Traveller of Armenia] 2 vol. (Constantinople, 1879-85).
- Taġean, Y., C'uc'ak hayerġn jefagrac' Kayserakan matenadaranin i Vienna [Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts at the Imperial Library of Vienna], (Vienna, 1891).
- C'uc'ak hayerġn jefagrac' matenadaranin Mxit'areanc' i Vienna [Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts at the Mxit'arist Library in Vienna], (Vienna, 1895).
- T'emuryan, V., "Hayeri artagalt'e depi Gamirk' llrd darum [The Emigration of Armenians to Cappadocia in the 11th Century]", Teġekagir #2 (1955).
- Ter-Davt'yan, K'.S., Pamiatniki Armianskoj Agiografii [Monuments of Armenian Hagiography], (Erevan, 1973).
- Ter-Lewondyan, A., The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia, N.G.Garsoian, trans. (Lisbon, 1976).
- "Hayerġ Egiptosum [The Armenians in Egypt]", HAP ch.30.
- "K'ust-i Kapkoh varġakan miavori verapruknere Kalifayut'yan Ķamanak [Survivals of the Administrative Unit of Kust-i Kapkoh in the Time of the Caliphate]", Teġekagir #9 (1958).

- "Sah Armenneri amirayut'yune Xlat'um [The Emirate of the Shah Armenians at Xlat']", HAP ch.28.
 - "Xedenekyan Arcruninere Vaspurakanum [The Xedenekean Arcrunids in Vaspurakan]", HAP ch. 28.
 - "Zak'aria ev Ivanei arabataf arianagrut'yune anberdum [Zak'aria's and Ivane's Inscription in Arabic from Anberd]", PBH #1 (1971).
- Thomson, R.W., "The Influence of their Environment on the Armenians in Exile in the Eleventh Century", Congrès international des études byzantines, 13th (Oxford, 1967) (Congress).
- Togan, A.Z.V., "Still Missing Works of Rashid al-Dīn", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964).
- T'op'uzyan, Ō. X., "Mi'jagetk'i ev Asorik'i haykakan gait'-avayrere [Armenian Settlements in Mesopotamia and Syria]", HAP ch. 30.
- Toumanoff, C., "Armenia and Georgia", The Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV, The Byzantine Empire, part I (Cambridge, 1966) ch. XIV.
- "Background to Mantzikert", Congress (Oxford, 1967).
 - "Caucasia and Byzantium", Traditio 27 (1971).
 - "The Fifteenth-Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia", Traditio 7 (1949-51).
 - "The Mamikonids and the Liparitids", Armeniaca (Venice, 1969).
 - "Medieval Georgian Historical Literature(VII-XVth Centuries)", Traditio 1 (1943).
 - Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown,1963).

- T'uršyan, H.G., "Šah-i-Armenner [The Shāh-i-Armens]",
PBH #4 (1964).
- Ulubabyan, B.A., Xaçeni išanut'yuna X-XVI darrerum [The
Principality of Xaçen in the X-XVI Centuries],
(Erevan, 1975).
- Vryonis, S., The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia
Minor and the Process of Islamization from the
Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century (Los Angeles,
1971) [DMH].
- "Seljuk Gulams and Ottoman Devshirmes", Der Islam
XLI (1965).
- Kaçikyan, L.S., "Syunyac' Örbelyanneri Burt'elyan čvula
[The Biwrt'elian Branch of the Siwnid Orbeleans]",
BM #9 (1969).
- "Havastane Čobanyanneri ev Jelairyanneri tirapetut'yan
žamanakašřianum [Armenia in the Period of the
Domination of the Chobanids and Jalayirids]", HAP IV
ch. 1.
- "Havastani k'alak'akan vičake ev soc'ial-tntesakan
haraberut yunnere XIV-XV darrerum [Armenia's Political
Situation and Socio-Economic Relations in the
XIV-XVth Centuries]", HAP IV ch. 1.
- Yovsēp'ean, G., "Nor niwt'er T'ovma Mecop'ec'u kensagrut'ean
hamar [New Materials for the Biography of T'ovma
Mecop'ec'i]", Ararat (1913).
- Potomstvo Tarsaicha Orbeliana i Mina-Khatuny [The
Posterity of Tarsayič Orbelean and Mina-Khatun],
Khristianskii Vostok, II (1913).
- Xaibakeank' kam Pfošeanck' [The Xaibakeans or Pfošeans]
(Antelias, 1969) reprint of the 1928 edition.
- Yuzbašyan, K.N., "Deilemity v povestvovanii Aristakēsa
Lastiverttsi [The Dailamites in Aristakes Lastivert-
c'i's Narration]", Palestinskii Sbornik #7 (1962).

- with Agadzanov, S.G., "K istorii tiurskikh nabegov na Armeniiu v XIv [Toward the History of the Turkish Raids on Armenia in the 11th Century]", Palestinskii Sbornik #12 (1965).
- Zamkoçyan, H., "Ani k'alak'um erku XIIIrd arjanagrut'yunneri masin [On Two 13th Century Inscriptions from the City of Ani]", GAEPH #47 (1958).
- "Patmut'iwn vasn azgin netoçac' erki heinake [The Author of the Work History of the Nation of the Archers]" GAEPH #23 (1946).

GLOSSARY

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| <u>amir-hejub</u> | Grand Chamberlain. |
| <u>amir-spasalar</u> | Commander-in-Chief of the Army. |
| <u>atabek</u> | "father-guardian". |
| <u>azat</u> | Arm./Iran. literally "free", designation for lesser gentry. |
| <u>bahatur</u> | "hero". |
| <u>basqaq</u> | "tax collector". |
| <u>didebul</u> | Georg. "great one", high noble. |
| <u>elchi</u> | envoy, ambassador. |
| <u>eristav</u> | Georg. "duke", head of a province. |
| <u>hayrenik'</u> | Arm. "patrimony", a form of landhold. |
| <u>Il-Khān</u> | Mong. subordinate Khān, title of the Khan of Iran (i.e., subordinate to the Great Khān). |
| <u>injū</u> | Mong. "demesne", a landhold directly tributary to the Khan or members of the Khan's family. |
| <u>jizya</u> | poll-tax, originally on non-Muslims. |
| <u>kat'olikos</u> | head of the Armenian Church. |
| <u>kesik(toyk)</u> | "imperial guard". |
| <u>kharaj</u> | land tax. |
| <u>khatun</u> | "queen, princess, lady". |
| <u>mal</u> | "property, cattle tax". |
| <u>mandat'urt'-uxuc'es</u> | Georg. "High Marshall" of the Georgian Court. |
| <u>mecatun</u> | Arm. literally "of a great House", wealthy merchant. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| <u>msaxurt'-uxuc'es</u> | Georg. Treasurer of the Georgian Court. |
| <u>naxarar</u> | Arm. "noble". |
| <u>noyin</u> | "general, commander, official". |
| <u>paiza</u> | tablet of authority. |
| <u>quriltai</u> | national assembly. |
| <u>sāhīb-dīvān</u> | Minister of Finance. |
| <u>šahna</u> | "guards". |
| <u>taghar</u> | a tax in kind. |
| <u>tanutēr</u> | Arm. "lord of the House". |
| <u>tēr</u> | Arm. "lord", secular and clerical. |
| <u>tumen</u> | 10,000 troops. |
| <u>tun</u> | Arm. "House, clan, family". |
| <u>vardapet</u> | Arm. doctor of the Armenian Church. |
| <u>yarligh</u> | "decree, order, law". |
| <u>yasax</u> | code of law. |
| <u>yayla</u> | "pasturing grounds". |